

Modern Philology

VOL. II.

April, 1905.

No. 4.

THE SOURCES OF JONSON'S "DISCOVERIES."

THE final pages of Ben Jonson's *Timber, or Discoveries*, which appeared posthumously in 1641, are devoted to a discussion of the nature of poetry and the drama. In the annotated edition of Professor Schelling these pages are about fifteen in number; and in this brief paper I desire to call attention to their sources.

I. Daniel Heinsius, the distinguished Dutch scholar, published his treatise, *De tragœdiae constitutione*, at Leyden in 1611, and it was immediately accepted by critics and playwrights as a work of the highest authority; Chapelain called it "the quintessence of Aristotle's *Poetics*," and it was cited by Corneille and annotated by Racine. The whole of Jonson's final essay, "Of the Magnitude and Compass of Any Fable, Epic or Dramatic" (ed. Schelling, pp. 83-87), is a literal translation of the fourth chapter of Heinsius's treatise. Two other important passages (pp. 78-79, 79-80) are also taken bodily from the same source. I have set the texts side by side, and no further introduction is necessary. To another treatise of Heinsius, *Ad Horatii de Pluto et Terentio judicium dissertatio*,¹ Jonson was indebted in his discussion

¹This appeared as one of the notes at the end of HEINSIUS's edition of Horace (Leyden, 1612, notes, pp. 78-99), and was republished as a separate dissertation in his edition of Terence in 1635. It has been reprinted many times, and is readily accessible in ZEUNE's edition of Terence (London, 1820; cf. Vol. I, pp. xxxviii ff., lviii) or in that of GILES (London, 1837; cf. pp. xxv ff., xxxix). The marginal note in the original folio edition of the *discoveries* (1641, p. 129: "Heins: de Sat: . . . Pug: in comm. 153 & seq.") evidently refers to this obligation, but the pagination, if correct, is that of some edition which I have been unable to find. Professor Schelling, who seems to have had the same difficulty, refers his readers to HEINSIUS's Horace, 1612, notes, p. 61; if he had turned to p. 78 of that very edition, he would have discovered the actual source of Jonson's indebtedness. Over nine pages in all are due to these two treatises of Heinsius.

of the ludicrous (*Discoveries*, p. 81, l. 6—p. 83, l. 13; also p. 80, ll. 26 ff.); but these passages it does not seem necessary to cite.

II. The Bohemian Jesuit, Jacobus Pontanus, published a treatise on poetry, *Poeticarum institutionum libri tres*, at Ingolstadt, in 1594. This work was received with considerable favor, and was reprinted at least twice before the close of the century. Soon after, Joannes Buchler, of Gladbach, made an abstract of Pontanus's treatise, under the title of *Reformata poeseos institutio, ex R. P. Jacobi Pontani libris concinnata*, and appended it to his poetical dictionary, *Sacrarum profanarumque phrasium poeticarum thesaurus*. The combined work was reprinted many times, and at least five editions were published at London during the course of the seventeenth century. From Buchler's abridgment of Pontanus Jonson has borrowed several important passages, but his debt here is more casual and intermittent than in the case of Heinsius. I cite one example, though I cannot consider it as having any special significance.¹ I have used the eleventh edition of Buchler, which was printed at London in 1632, five years before Jonson's death.

JONSON'S *Timber, or Discoveries*.
(Ed. Schelling, Boston, 1892,
p. 78.)

Aristotle was the first accurate critic and truest judge, nay, the greatest philosopher the world ever had; for he noted the vices of all knowledges in all creatures, and out of many men's perfections in a science he formed still one art. So he taught us two offices together, how we ought to judge rightly of others, and what we ought to imitate specially in ourselves; but all this in vain without a natural wit and a poetical nature in chief. For no man, so soon as he knows this or reads it, shall be able to write

HEINSIUS'S *De tragoeiae constitutione*.
(Leyden, 1643, pp. 3, 4.)

Primus Aristoteles, & quod Critici est accurati, vitia notauit: & quod veri est philosophi, è virtutibus multorum, vnam fecit artem: simulque vtrunque docuit; tum de aliis quid statuendum, tum in nostris, quid sequendum esset. Frusta tamen, ni ingenium accedat, sed poeticum in primis. Neque enim qui haec sciit, ideo Tragoediam conscribet: sed si aptus à natura ac ingenio accedat, ideo perfectam scribet. . . . Iam prudenter civilis, ubi magis requiritur? non in sententiis & gnomis modo:

¹ For other passages in which Jonson appears to have borrowed from Buchler, cf. JONSON, p. 76, and BUCHLER, pp. 418, 427; JONSON, p. 77, and BUCHLER, p. 421.

the better; but as he is adopted by nature, he shall grow the perfecter writer. He must have civil prudence and eloquence, and that whole, not taken up by snatches or pieces in sentences or remnants when he will handle business or carry counsels, as if he came then out of the declaimer's gallery or shadow furnished but out of the body of the state, which commonly is the school of men: *Virorum schola respub[lica]*.

JONSON, pp. 79, 80.

I am not of that opinion to conclude a poet's liberty within the narrow limits of laws which either the grammarians or philosophers prescribe. For before they found out those laws there were many excellent poets that fulfilled them, amongst whom none more perfect than Sophocles, who lived a little before Aristotle. Which of the Greeklings durst ever give precepts to Demosthenes? or to Pericles, whom the age surnamed Heavenly, because he seemed to thunder and lighten with his language? or to Alcibiades, who had rather Nature for his guide than Art for his master? But whatsoever nature at any time dictated to the most happy, or long exercise to the most laborious, that the wisdom and learning of Aristotle hath brought into an art because he understood the causes of things; and what other men did by chance or custom he doth by reason; and not only found out the way not to err, but the short way we should take not to err. Many

sed, quod felicissime à te præstitionem meminimus non semel, cum consilia tractantur. non ex umbra enim ad hæc accedebas: sed cum in Repub. versatus essem, quæ magnatum schola est.

HEINSIUS, pp. 2, 3.

Neque in ea sum opinione, vt ad eas, quas grammatici præscribunt, aut philosophi angustias, potè libertatem esse revocandam arbitrer. cum præsertim ante observationes has summi in Tragedia extiterint poëtæ. nemo enim postea ad majestatem Sophocleam, meo quidem animo, accessit. quem non paucis annis ante Aristotelem, Philosophorum Regem fato suo functum satis constat. Verum idem aliis in artibus quoque vsu venit. Nam quis Græculorum vñquam qui dicendi traderent præcepta, ad diuinam & fatalem vim Demosthenis accisit, qui plerisque multo est antiquior? Nec Pericles ante eum, quem Olympium dixere, quod tonare ac fulgurare videretur, neque Alcibiades, ac alii, quos ante hos fuisse in Republica disertos fama tenet, præceptorem potius quem sequerentur, quam naturam ducem habuerunt. Sed quecumque aut felicibus natura dictat, aut exercitatio prolixa dat laboriosis, quod Latini nescio an satis recte habi-

things in Euripides hath Aristophanes wittily reprehended, not out of art, but out of truth. For Euripides is sometimes peccant, as he is most times perfect. But judgment when it is greatest, if reason doth not accompany it, is not ever absolute.

tum dixerint, in artem redigit vir sapiens & eruditus. Ita fit, vt & causas intelligat, & quæ forte alii efficiunt aut vsu, ex ratione agat: neque viam tantum ne aberret, sed & habeat compendium qua eat. Multa in Euripide facete Aristophanes notauit; neque ex arte sed è vero tamen. Sæpe Euripides, alibi quæ peccat, alibi plenissime & accuratè præstat. judicium enim, etiam cum summum est, nisi ratio accedat, non est absolutum.

JONSON, pp. 83-87.

*Of the magnitude and compass
of any fable, epic or dramatic.*

.

If a man would build a house, he would first appoint a place to build it in, which he would define within certain bounds. So in the constitution of a poem, the action is aimed at by the poet, which answers place in a building, and that action hath his largeness, compass, and proportion. But as a court or king's palace requires other dimensions than a private house, so the epic asks a magnitude from other poems, since what is place in the one is action in the other; the difference is in space. So that by this definition we conclude the fable to be the imitation of one perfect and entire action, as one perfect and entire place is required to a building. By perfect, we understand that to which nothing is wanting, as place to the building that is

HEINSIUS, pp. 28-38.

Cap. IV.

*Ambitus Tragœdiæ & magnitudo.
Actio quæ tota & perfecta. Quæ
sit Vna Actio. quot item modis
dicatur Vnam. Quo modo in
Tragœdia Vna requiratur Actio.*

Quemadmodum ædificio qui cogitat, primo ei locum designare solet; quem mox certa magnitudine ac ambitu definit: ita in Tragediæ, de qua nunc agimus, constitutione, à Philosopho est factum. Id in quo versatur Tragedia, est actio. Sicut autem ædificio locus, sic Tragediæ accommodatur actio, magnitudine, ambitu, proportione. Igitar vt aliam requirit magnitudinem vel regia vel aula, quam priuata domus: ita aliam Tragoedia requirit actionem quam Epos. Nam cum vtriusque sit actio, sicut ibi vtriusque est locus; spatio vtrobique multum differunt; hic actio, ibi locus. Jam vero, tum perfecte tum totius actionis imitationem esse Tragediam, in definitione audiuius: ita vt perfectus ac totus ad ædificium requiritur locus. Perfectum autem id

raised, and action to the fable that is formed. It is perfect, perhaps not for a court or king's palace, which requires a greater ground, but for the structure we would raise; so the space of the action may not prove large enough for the epic fable, yet be perfect for the dramatic, and whole.

What we understand by whole.¹ —Whole we call that, and perfect, which hath a beginning, a midst, and an end. So the place of any building may be whole and entire for that work, though too little for a palace. As to a tragedy or a comedy, the action may be convenient and perfect that would not fit an epic poem in magnitude. So a lion is a perfect creature in himself, though it be less than that of a buffalo or rhinocerote. They differ but in specie: either in the kind is absolute; both have their parts, and either the whole. Therefore, as in every body, so in every action which is the subject of a just work, there is required a certain proportionable greatness, neither too vast nor too minute. For that which happens to the eyes when we behold a body, the same happens to the memory when we contemplate an action. I look upon a monstrous giant, as Tityus, whose body covered nine acres of land, and mine eye sticks upon every part; the whole that consists of those parts will never be taken in at one entire view. So in a fable, if the action be too great, we can never comprehend the whole to-

est, cui nihil deest. in loco quidem ædificii respectu, quod construitur: in Tragoedia autem actionis, quæ formatur. vt perfectus autem, non pro regia aut aula, que majorem postulat, sed pro ædificio ipso, ædificii est locus: ita spatium actionis, non pro Epico opere immensum, sed pro Dramate ipso requiratur perfectum. id autem minus est. Jam vero totum est, quod principium, medium habet, & finem. Ita ædificii locus est totus, quamvis minor sit quam aulæ: vt & Tragœdie actionem esse totam oportet, licet minor quam Epicæ. Sic perfectum animal est leo, quamvis multum cedat elephanto. Totum est leonis caput, licet minus sit quam vri aut tauri. Alteri enim differunt specie, & in sua absolutus est vterque: alterum partes habet suas, ideoque est totum. Sicut ergo omni in corpore, ita & in actione qualibet, quæ sit justi poematis subjectum, certa magnitudine est opus; quæ nec vasta nec exigua sit nimis. Quippe id quod euenire oculis solet, corpus cum videmus, idem euenit memoriae, cum actionem contemplamur. vastum enim corpus qui videt, dum in partibus quibusque haeret, totum illud vnicumque quod è partibus his ipsis constat, sequi intuitu non potest. In poemate, si magna nimium est actio, nemo totum simul cogitatione complectetur. contra si exile nimium est corpus, nulla ex intuitu illius oritur voluptas. Nulla enim datur contemplanti mora. quia simul sit intuitus & euanescit. Sicut qui formicam

¹This and the following marginal headings of the original folio correspond more or less to Heinsius's chapter headings.

gether in our imagination. Again, if it be too little, there ariseth no pleasure out of the object; it affords the view no stay; it is beheld, and vanisheth at once. As if we should look upon an ant or pismire, the parts fly the sight, and the whole considered is almost nothing. The same happens in action, which is the object of memory, as the body is of sight. Too vast oppresseth the eyes, and exceeds the memory; too little scarce admits either.

What the utmost bound of a fable.—Now in every action it behoves the poet to know which is his utmost bound, how far with fitness and a necessary proportion he may produce and determine it; that is, till either good fortune change into worse, or the worse into the better. For as a body without proportion cannot be goodly, no more can the action, either in comedy or tragedy, without his fit bounds. And every bound, for the nature of the subjeet, is esteemed the best that is largest, till it can increase no more, so it behoves the action in tragedy or comedy to be let grow till the necessity ask a conclusion; wherein two things are to be considered: first, that it exceed not the compass of one day; next, that there be place left for digression and art. For the episodes and digressions in a fable are the same that household stuff and other furniture are in a house. And so far form the measure and extent of a fable dramatic.

What [is meant] by one and entire.—Now that it should be one

videt. nam cum partes fugiant conspectum, totum quoque prope est nullum. Idem sit in actione. Sicut enim ibi corpus oculorum, ita hie memoriae objectum est actio. adde quod vt magna nimium, conspectum, ita & memoriam excedant: parua vix admittant. . . . [Here Jonson skips from the top of page 31 to the bottom of page 32.] . . . Primo enim crescere eo vsque recte ac produci posse, putat, donec pro earum qua aguntur rerum ordine, vel necessario vel commode mutatio inferatur. qui supremus hic est terminus: cum videlicet aut prospera in aduersam, aut aduersa in secundam mutatur fortuna. Sicut ergo corpus, sine magnitudine pulchrum esse non potest, ita neque actio Tragoedie. Et vt omnis qui pro rei natura est terminus, is habetur præstantissimus qui est maximus, donec crescere amplius non potest: ita ipsam crescere hactenus Tragoedie oportet actionem, donec necessario sit terminanda. In quo duo sunt tenenda. Primo vt vnius non excedat Solis ambitum. Secundo, vt digressioni locus relinquatur & arti. Quippe quod in domo est supellex cæteraque ornamenta, hoc in Tragedia digressiones sunt & Episodia. Hactenus ergo, quantam esse Fabulam Tragedie oporteat & actionem. Videntum & illud; vtrum vnam. Vnum duobus dicitur, vt plurimum, modis. Vel quod vnicum est, separatum, ac simplex, vt ante. Vel id quod compositum ex pluribus, postquam plura illa jam coauerunt, vnum esse coepit. Priori modo, vnam esse oportere Fabulam, nemo eru-

and entire. One is considerable two ways; either as it is only separate, and by itself, or as being composed of many parts, it begins to be one as those parts grow or are wrought together. That it should be one the first way alone, and by itself, no man that hath tasted letters ever would say, especially having required before a just magnitude and equal proportion of the parts in themselves. Neither of which can possibly be, if the action be single and separate, not composed of parts, which laid together in themselves, with an equal and fitting proportion, tend to the same end; which thing out of antiquity itself hath deceived many, and more this day it doth deceive. So many there be of old that have thought the action of one man to be one, as of Hercules, Theseus, Achilles, Ulysses, and other heroes; which is both foolish and false, since by one and the same person many things may be severally done which cannot fitly be referred or joined to the same end: which not only the excellent tragic poets, but the best masters of the epic, Homer and Virgil, saw. For though the argument of an epic poem be far more diffused and poured out than that of tragedy, yet Virgil, writing of Æneas, hath pretermitted many things. He neither tells how he was born, how brought up, how he fought with Achilles, how he was snatched out of battle by Venus; but that one thing, how he came into Italy, he prosecutes in twelve books. The rest of his journey, his error by sea, the sack of Troy, are

datus dixerit. Duo quippe in Tragica requiri actione jam monuimus. magnitudinem vt justam, ita & aequalem inter sese proportionem partium. quorum neutrum, si sit vna actio ac simplex, non composta ex partibus, quæ tum ad eundem tendunt finem, tum proportione apta ac aequali inter sese componuntur, posse fieri videtur. quæ res plurimus ex ipsa antiquitate imposuit, etiamque hodie imponit. Sic non pauci olim arbitrati sunt, vnius actionem esse vnam. Puta Herculis, Thesei, Achillis, Vlyssis, & aliorum. Quod ineptum est ac falsum. cum ab uno eodemque multa fieri omnino possint, quæ conjungi & referri ad eundem finem commode non possunt. Quod non modo Tragici praestantes, verum & poëte Epici, Homerus pariter ac Maro, viderunt. Quanquam enim longe amplius diffusiusque Epici quam Tragici sit argumentum, tamen plurima Æneæ Maro prætermisit. Non enim. quomodo sit natus ac eductus, cum Achille quomodo confixerit, ac prælio eruptus fuerit à Venere. vnum hoc, quopacto in Italiam peruererit, libris duodecim, quod nemo nescit, persecutus est. Reliqua quippe, de itinere, vrbis expugnatione, aliaque, non vt argumentum operis, sed vt argumenti Episodia ponuntur. quemadmodum & Vlyssis plurima Homerus prætermisit: neque plura, quam quæ tendere ad eundem ac spectare finem videbantur, conjunxit. Contra ineptissime poëte, quos Philosophus recenset. quorum alter omnes Thesei, alter Herculis labores actionesque fuerat com-

put not as the argument of the work, but episodes of the argument. So Homer laid by many things of Ulysses, and handled no more than he saw tended to one and the same end. Contrary to which, and foolishly, those poets did, whom the philosopher taxeth, of whom one gathered all the actions of Theseus, another put all the labors of Hercules in one work. So did he whom Juvenal mentions in the beginning, "hoarse Codrus," that recited a volume compiled, which he called his *Theseid*, not yet finished, to the great trouble both of his hearers and himself; amongst which there were many parts had no coherence nor kindred one with other, so far they were from being one action, one fable. For as a house, consisting of divers materials becomes one structure and one dwelling, so an action, composed of divers parts, may become one fable, epic or dramatic. For example, in a tragedy, look upon Sophocles his *Ajax*: Ajax, deprived of Achilles's armor, which he hoped from the suffrage of the Greeks, despairs, and, growing impatient of the injury, rageth, and turns mad. In that humor he doth many senseless things, and at last falls upon the Grecian flock and kills a great ram for Ulysses: returning to his sense, he grows ashamed of the scorn, and kills himself; and is by the chiefs of the Greeks forbidden burial. These things agree and hang together, not as they were done, but as seeming to be done, which made the action whole, entire, and absolute.

plexus. Neque aliter intelligendus ille Iuuenalis locus est de Codro, quem idcirco raucum ibi dixit, quod immensum opus, in quo omnes Thesei recenserentur actiones, summa cum & auditorum molestia & sua, recitaret. inter quas fuisse sane plurimas oportet, quae nil inter se commune haberent. quare neque vnam siue actionem siue fabulam subjectum operis habebat, sed vnius. Cæterum vt domus non ex uno constat sed est vna: ita non ex uno constat, etiam si vna, actio Tragoedie. . . . Exempli gratia, Sophoclis Aiacem videamus: Aiax armis priuatus, indignatur, & vt erat contumelie impatiens, rabit ac furiit. Ergo, quod pro tali est, haud pauca sine mente agit, & postremo pro Vlysse pecudes insanus mactat. vbi autem ad se rediit, opprobrii pertesus, manus sibi infert, ac se pulchro prohibetur. quæ, non autem cætera, quæcunque toto vite tempore ab Ajace gesta, apte inter se cohærent. Sed nec quælibet ex illis per se sufficit: omnes vero congruentes, vnam illam statuunt cuius sunt partes. Quippe & totam debere esse actionem diximus, & absolutam. Totum autem vt ex partibus constat, neque sine omnibus partibus est totum, ita vt sit absolutum, non modo omnes requiruntur partes, sed & tales quæ sunt veræ. Totius autem pars est vera, quam si tollas, aut mouetur totum, aut non amplius est totum. Nam quod tale est, vt siue absit, siue adsit, plane ad totum nil intersit, pars totius dici proprie non potest. Qualia sunt Episodia, de quibus postea agemus. vel ejusdem actionis

The conclusion concerning the whole, and the parts.—Which are episodes.—For the whole, as it consisteth of parts, so without all the parts it is not the whole; and to make it absolute is required not only the parts, but such parts as are true. For a part of the whole was true, which, if you take away, you either change the whole or it is not the whole. For if it be such a part, as, being present or absent, nothing concerns the whole, it cannot be called a part of the whole; and such are the episodes, of which hereafter. For the present here is one example: the single combat of Ajax with Hector, as it is at large described in Homer, nothing belongs to this Ajax of Sophocles.

JONSON, p. 74.

But how differs a Poem from what we call a Poesy?—A poem, as I have told you, is the work of a poet; the end and fruit of his labor and study. Poesy is his skill or craft of making; the very fiction itself, the reason or form of the work. And these three voices differ, as the thing done, the doing, and the doer; the thing feigned, the feigning, and the feigner; so the poem, the poesy, and the poet. Now the poesy is the habit of the art

nes longe diuersæ. Sic, exempli gratia, singulare Ajacis cum Hecatore certamen, quod prolixè describitur Homero, ad Ajacem Sophoclis non spectat.

BUCHLER'S *Phrasium poeticarum thesaurus* (p. 414).

Quid distent Poëma & Poësis.

Caput VI.

Poëma est opus ipsum Poëtae, id nimirum quod effectum est, finis & fructus operæ atque studij, quod impendit Poëta. Poësis est fictio ipsa, ratione ac forma Poëmatis, sive industria atque opera facientis: ut Poëma, Poësis, Poëta, hæc tria differant, quomodo tres personæ verbi à quibus oriuntur, πεποίημα, περοίησαι, πεποίηται. A prima existit Poëma, ab altera Poësis, à tertia Poëta, quasi dicas factum, factio, factor; aut factum, fictio, factor Poësis interdum ipsum etiam habitum seu artem, Poëticam videlicet ipsam declarat.¹

¹ Buchler's original is to be found in PONTANUS, *Institutiones poeticæ* (Ingolstadt, 1594), p. 20. SCALIGER, *Poeticæ*, lib. i, cap. 2 (ed. 1617, p. 12), uses very similar language. The distinction was, of course, a commonplace of the classical schools, and may be found in Plu-

The significance of this literal translation seems to me greater than the mere problem of *Quellenforschungen*. Here is no question of plagiarism, for the *Discoveries* were never published during Jonson's lifetime, and there is no evidence that they were ever intended for publication. I have not as yet concluded my researches, nor can the literary historian afford to devote much of his time to the subsidiary task of source-hunting; but these initial results appear to suggest that the *Discoveries* were merely a commonplace book, in which Jonson recorded jottings of any kind which might seem to have future usefulness. But we are lucky indeed to have even the commonplace book of the author of *Vpone*.

In the second place, the significance of Jonson's interest in Heinsius, Pontanus, and Buchler is this: the influence of the Italian critics had to some extent been superseded by that of the Dutch and German critics during the first half of the seventeenth century.

J. E. SPINGARN.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

tarch, Cornelius Fronto, Aphthonius, Hermogenes, and others (cf. WALZ, *Rhet. Græci*, 1832, pp. 16, 60; VOSSIUS, *De nat. et const. poet.*, cap. iv, §2, and GUMMERE, in *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. XIX, pp. 61, 132). But here Jonson certainly seems to employ the language of Buchler or of Buchler's original; I am inclined to think that he was acquainted with both.

THE "BLESSED BOYS" IN FAUST AND KLOPSTOCK.

THAT the "Selige Knaben" in the last scene of *Faust*, especially their mystic relation to the Pater Seraphicus and their gradual growth in spiritual insight and power, were suggested to Goethe by reminiscences of Swendenborgian theories on the nature of heavenly spirits, is generally recognized and beyond dispute. It seems, however, worthy of notice that long before Goethe wrote this scene, another German poet, probably also inspired, at least indirectly, by Swedenborg, had given a picture of the gradual transformation of the souls of children into heavenly youths which is strikingly like Goethe's representation of the change that comes over the Blessed Boys and over Faust himself as they ascend to ever higher regions.

Of the "Selige Knaben" the Pater Seraphicus says:

11918. Steigt hinan zu höh'rem Kreise,
Wachset immer unvermerkt,
Wie, nach ewig reiner Weise,
Gottes Gegenwart verstärkt.
Denn das ist der Geister Nahrung,
Die im freisten Aether waltet,
Ewigen Liebens Offenbarung
Die zur Seligkeit entfaltet.

And the "Selige Knaben" themselves say of Faust:

12076. Er überwächst uns schon
An mächtigen Gliedern;
Wird treuer Pflege Lohn
Reichlich erwidern.
Wir wurden früh entfernt
Von Lebechören;
Doch dieser hat gelernt,
Er wird uns lehren.

Does it not seem probable that in all this there is to be found a lingering reminiscence of the impressive picture which Klopstock in the sixteenth Canto of the *Messias* gives of the flight of

hosts of children through the heavenly regions and their growth in bodily shape as well as in spiritual insight? These are Klopstock's words:

320. Melodieen, der süssesten Wonne Gespielinnen, stiegen
 Mit dem Lispel empor der Engelharfen. Denn endlos
 Kamen vom Ganges, vom Rhein, dem Niagara, und Nilus,
 An den Cedern einher auf Tabor, Seelen der Kinder.
 Wie gesondert von vielen und grossen Herden, an Einem
 Langen Hügel hinab, genährt vom Frühlinge, Lämmer
 Weiden, so kamen einher an des Tabor Haine die Seelen.
 Aber der Richter richtete nicht. Sie wurden der Wege
 Viele geführt, von Sterne geführt zu Sterne, bevor sie,
 Himmlische Jünglinge nun, erhabnere Pfade betraten.
 Manches sahn sie zuvor auf ihren Wegen, und lernten
 Manches, umtanzt von fröhlichen Stunden.

Otto Lyon, *Goethes Verhältnis zu Klopstock*, pp. 30–103, shows that the strongest influence of Klopstock upon Goethe was exerted during the years 1770–75. Since Canto XVI of the *Messias* appeared in 1773, the above-quoted passage would have come to Goethe's knowledge during the time of his most eager interest in Klopstock, and would therefore have been most likely to retain its hold upon his memory.

KUNO FRANCKE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE SONNET FORMS OF WYATT AND SURREY.

THE current view with regard to the sonnet forms of Wyatt and Surrey is that Wyatt in trying to follow the traditions made a blunder which gave Surrey the hint for a happy innovation. It is agreed that Wyatt's sonnets are divided, after the Italian manner, into octave and sestet; but his custom of rhyming the last two lines of the sestet is looked upon as evidence that he unintelligently divided this part of the sonnet into a quatrain and couplet, and the error is charged to him personally. Thus Mr. Courthope¹ says: "Wyatt unaware of the secret principle unfortunately misled by his admiration for the Strambotti, endeavored to construct his sonnets on the same principle;" while Professor Schipper² prints *abba abba cddc ee* as the typical Wyatt scheme, and says nothing of other Italian types than the Petrarchan. The sonnet of Surrey is universally described as formed from the Wyatt type by breaking up the octave into quatrains with different rhymes, and substituting alternate for included rhymes in all three quatrains thus formed.

These conceptions must, I think, be modified. As for Wyatt, it is certain that his form is taken from French and Italian models. There is small doubt that he meant to divide his sestets, not into quatrains *plus* couplets, but into terzets, and that more often than not he did so. He did indeed blunder and exhibit a lack of feeling for rhetorical and rhythmic organization, but did not intentionally diverge from the model he set before him. Surrey's sonnet, moreover, appears to be unquestionably influenced by Wyatt's, but not to be a type created by loosening the bonds of Wyatt's form. It belongs in nature to a somewhat different genus, and is a strambotto built up to fourteen lines, like the eight-line or twelve-line poems of the same general organization.

For the study of Wyatt, the text requires careful consideration.

¹ *History of English Poetry*, Vol. II, p. 91.

² *Englische Metrik*, Vol. II, p. 844.

There are four sources¹ of the text of Wyatt's poems: first, a manuscript [E.] partly in Wyatt's own hand, partly by an amanuensis (Nott's Harrington MS I, reprinted with great pains by Dr. E. Flügel in *Anglia* [A.], Vols. XVIII and XIX, under the name of Egerton MS 2711); secondly, a manuscript [D.] nearly or quite contemporary with Wyatt, from a circle of persons associated with Surrey directly, with Wyatt less closely (Nott's Duke of Devonshire's MS; British Museum Add. MS 17492); thirdly, an Elizabethan manuscript miscellany [H.] (Nott's Harrington MS II; Nott's transcript is British Museum Add. MS 28635); and, finally, Tottel's printed miscellany [T.], here cited from Arber's reprint. The sonnets in E. are certainly by Wyatt, those in D. almost certainly so. The attributions of authorship in H. and T., though probably right in most cases, deserve little respect when there is a question as to a particular poem. H. and T. are independent; hence where they agree their testimony as to authorship is of weight. The text of E. is the author's own; that of D. is at least not intentionally falsified. That of T. is the worst, for it has been systematically altered, even to the extent of filling out the refrain of a rondeau to make up a complete line.

In E. there are twenty-four sonnets. D. adds four, H. three, and T. one—a total of thirty-two.

Safe conclusions can be drawn only from the twenty-eight in E. and D. They are all of one type—that Italian form with the last two lines rhyming which is commonly associated with the name of Wyatt. The octave rhymes uniformly *abba abba*.² The end of the octave is felt to be the conclusion of the first main division in twenty-two of the sonnets, the pause comes within a line in three, one has no strophic quality, and two have pauses at a distance from the end of the octave.

As for the sestet, the rhyme scheme in nearly all cases (twenty-six) is *cddcee*. So far as form goes, this type of sestet is capable of being divided into symmetrical terzets—*cdd, cee*, or into a quatrain and couplet—*cldc, ee*. Examination shows that four sonnets have no distinct pause in the sestet, and that thirteen

¹ FLÜGEL, in *Anglia*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 263 ff.

² *abba acca* in one case is the inferior reading of D.

have a distinct pause before the twelfth line. On the other hand, in nine the pause comes before the thirteenth. Two are doubtful. In five of the cases with a pause before the couplet there is a pause before the eleventh line, dividing the sestet into three pairs. On the whole, the testimony of these facts is to the effect that Wyatt regarded the sestet as a unit, tending rather to be divided into terzets than into a quatrain and couplet.

In E., Wyatt's own manuscript, ll. 5, 9, and 12 are often distinguished as beginning new stanzas—sometimes by a space, sometimes by a capital. L. 9, the beginning of the sestet, is thus distinguished, according to Dr. Flügel's reprint, sixteen times out of twenty-four; l. 12, the first line of the second terzet, fourteen times; l. 13, once. There would seem to be little doubt that the typical sonnet scheme of Wyatt is *abba | abba || cdd | cee*. The failure to attain this ideal in a tolerably large proportion of cases may most probably be laid to Wyatt's lack of ability to mass his verse-periods with any skill, a halting awkwardness of structure being evident in very many of the poems, especially where Wyatt has no original to rest on. His translations (above half the total),¹ though not literal, are usually line for line, and of course follow the periodic organization of the original, except where that is due to devices of rhetoric and syntax which Wyatt had not skill or perception to retain.

It should be noticed that for the ordinary form of Wyatt's sonnets we need seek a model no farther than in the works of Mellin de Saint Gelais. Dr. Einstein² has remarked that Saint Gelais occasionally rhymes the last two verses of his sonnets. This is the case with nearly a third of the dozen and a half of sonnets written by the French poet, some three or four rhyming as the great majority of Wyatt's do, *cdd cee*, and as many like Wyatt's eighth, *cde dee*. All form obvious terzets. Koeppel's discovery³ of the original of one of Wyatt's sonnets in the works of Saint Gelais is well known; and the French writer may well have given the model for Wyatt's form.

¹Cf. Nott's annotations and KOEPPEL, *Romanische Forschungen*, Vol. V, p. 67, fully cited for E. in Flügel's reprint.

² *Italian Renaissance in England* (New York, 1902), p. 377.

³ *Anglia*, Vol. XIII, p. 77.

The type, however, is not unknown in Italian poetry before Wyatt.

From the twenty-eight well-authenticated sonnets we pass to the four attributed to Wyatt in H. and T. Only one appears in both. This is "The pillar perish'd," Aldine 25.¹ It is of the standard type, with no marked pause in the sestet. For two sonnets we have only the authority of H. They are the pair beginning "The flaming sighs"—Aldine 24. These two are treated as strophes of a single poem, the rhyme scheme of each being *abba cddc effe gg*. To attribute to Wyatt this unique pair of sonnets on so slender an authority as the unsupported testimony of H. appears to me unwarrantable. The same conclusion is justified with regard to the one sonnet—"Such is the course," Aldine 17—added to Wyatt's works on the sole authority of Tottel. The rhyme scheme is *abab abab abab cc*—a form not elsewhere exemplified in Wyatt's writings.

It is thus evident that all of those sonnets which we have perfectly solid grounds for ascribing to Wyatt are of one type.

The following table will make it easy to test the accuracy with which I have analyzed the sonnets. The Aldine serial number precedes the opening words of the sonnet. *Anglia* is cited by volume and page, Nott's 1816 edition [N.], by page; T., by Arber's pages. The numbers of the lines distinguished by capitals or spaces in E. are placed last. Pauses are indicated by lines thus |; where a pause comes within a line it is indicated by square brackets inclosing the rhyme-letter of that line.

1. "The longe love." A. XVIII, 274 (E.), N. 1, T. 33. *abba | abba || cde | edd* 1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12.
2. "Yet was I never." A. XVIII, 284 (E.), N. 2, T. 33. *abba | abba || cdd | cee* 1, 5, 9.
3. "Was never file." A. XVIII, 289 (E.), N. 2, T. 34. *abba | abba || cd | dc | ee* 1, 5, 9.
4. "The liuely sparkes." A. XVIII, 479 (E.), N. 3, T. 34. *abba | abb[a] || c[d]dc | ee* 1, 5, 9, 12.
5. "Such vain thought." A. XVIII, 488 (E.), N. 4, T. 35. *abba | abba || cdd | cee* 1, 5, 9, 12.

¹ Perhaps the most convenient way of citing Wyatt's sonnets is by their serial number in the Aldine edition.

6. "Unstable dream." A. XIX, 177 (E.), N. 4, T. 35. *abba | abba || cd | dce | e 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13.*
7. "Ye that in loue." A. XIX, 196 (E.), N. 5, T. 36. *abba | abba || cd | d | ce | e 1, 5, 9, 12.*
8. "If waker care." A. XIX, 201 (E.), N. 6, T. 36. *abba ab || ba cd | cd | ee (?) 1, 5, 9, 12.*
9. "Cesar when that." A. XVIII, 273 (E.), N. 6, T. 37. *abba | abba || cdd | cee 1, 9, 11, 12.*
10. "Eche man me telth." A. XVIII, 284 (E.), N. 7, T. 37. *abba a | bba || cdd | cee 1, 12.*
11. "Some fowls there be." A. XVIII, 460 (E.), N. 7, T. 38. *abba | abb | (?) ac | (?) dd | cee 1, 5, 8.*
12. "Because I still." A. XVIII, 461 (E.), N. 8, T. 38. *abba | abba || cdd | cee 1, 5, 9, 12.*
13. "I find no peace." A. XVIII, 463 (E.), N. 9, T. 39. *abba | abba || cdd | c | ee (?) 1, 5, 9, 12 (?) .*
14. "My galley charged." A. XVIII, 464 (E.), N. 9, T. 39. *abba | abba | cdd | cee 1, 12.*
15. "Avisyng the bright beames." A. XVIII, 465 (E.), N. 10, T. 40. *abbaa | bba || eddce | e 1, 5, 9, 12.*
16. "My love to scorn." N. 10 (D.), T. 55. *abba | abba || cdd | c | ee.*
17. "Such is the course." N. 11, T. 62. *abab | abab | ab | ab | cc.*
18. "Ever myn hap." A. XVIII, 466 (E.), N. 12, T. 68. *abba | abbac : dd | cee 1, 5, 9, 12.*
19. "Loue, Fortune and." A. XVIII, 466 (E.), N. 12, T. 69. *abba | abba || cdd | cee 1, 5, 9, 12.*
20. "How oft haue I." A. XVIII, 467 (E.), N. 13, T. 69. *abba | abba || cddc | ee 1, 5.*
21. "Like unto these." A. XVIII, 468 (E.), N. 13, T. 70. *abba | abba || cd | d | c | ee 1, 5, 9, 12.*
22. "If amourous fayth." A. XVIII, 286 (E.), N. 14, T. 70. Practically continuous.
23. "My hart I gaue thee." A. XVIII, 288 (E.), N. 15, T. 71. *abba | abba || cd | dc | ee (?) 1, 4, 8, 11.*
24. "The flaming sighs." (Harington II) { *abba | cddc | eff | e | gg.*
N. 15. (Two sonnets.) { *abba | cddc eff | egg.*
25. "The pillar perish'd." (Harington II) N. 16, T. 72. *abba | abba | cde dee.*
26. "Farewell Loue." A. XVIII, 287 (E.), N. 17, T. 70. *abba | abba || cddc | ee 1, 5, 9, 12.*
27. "Whoso list." A. XVIII, 276 (E.), N. 143. *abba | abba || cddcee 1, 3, 9, 12.*
28. "Divers doth use." N. 143 (D.). *abba | abba || cddc | ee.*

29. "I abide." N. 144 (D.). *abba | abba || cddc | ee.*
 30. "Though I myself." A. XVIII, 463 (E.), N. 145. *abba | abba || cdd | cee 1, 12.*
 31. "To rail or jest." N. 145 (D.). *abba | abba || caa | c | dd (?)*.

From the pen of Surrey we have fifteen sonnets universally accepted. One sonnet always printed with his works may be by Vaux. A table of these sonnets follows. As the sonnets are not collected in one place in the Aldine edition, the most convenient way in which to cite them is by the page in Arber's Tottel.

T. 4, N. 19. "The soote season." *abababababab | aa.*
 T. 8, N. 16. "Love that liveth." *abab | cdc | efef | gg.*
 T. 9a, N. 18. "In Cyprus springs." *abab | c | dc | efef | gg.* (Awkward.)
 T. 9b, N. 3. "From Tuscan." *abab | cdc | efef | gg.*
 [T. 10a, N. 20. "Brittle beautie." *abab abab abab | cc.* By Vaux?] T. 10b, N. 20. "Alas, so all things." *abab | ababa | bab | cc.*
 T. 11a, N. 50. "When Windsor walls." *ababedcd | efe : fgg.*
 T. 11b, N. 15. "Set me whereas." *abab | cdc | ef[e]f[g]g (?)*.
 T. 12a, N. 17. "I never saw." *abba | eddc | effe | gg.*

(*That*, l. 5, = so that; *yet*, l. 8, = up to this time; *clad*, l. 9, = being clad; *that*, l. 10, refers to black; *so*, l. 12, sums up the preceding lines.)

T. 12b, N. 17. "The golden gift." *abab | cdc | efef | gg.*
 T. 28a, N. 44. "The great Macedon." *abab | cdcd | fe | gg.*
 T. 28b, N. 46. "Divers thy death." *abab | cdc | efefgg.*
 T. 30, N. 44. "Th' Assyrian king." *abab | cdc | efefgg.*
 T. 32, N. 40. "The fancy which." *abab | ababa | cac | cc.*
 T. 218, N. 47. "In the rude age." *abab | cdc | efef | gg.*

(*blam'd* and *claim'd* probably not rhymes.)

N. 48. "Norfolk sprung thee." *abab | cdc | efef | gg.*

Eleven of these sonnets rhyme as follows: *ababcdcdefefgg*; one rhymes *abbacddceffegg*; one, *abababababcc*; one, *ababababaa*; one, *aþabaþaþaþacc*. The sonnet sometimes attributed to Vaux rhymes *abababababcc*.

The combination of the lines into verse-periods presents no small variety. In two (T. 4, 32), the first twelve lines make a unit, with the couplet added. (This is the case also with the sonnet of doubtful authorship.) In six others, there is a division, more or less decided, into four-line stanzas (T. 8, 9b, 12a, 12b, 218; N. 48). In two, the lines make no distinct system, but

the couplet stands apart from the twelve preceding verses (T. 9a, 28). These ten are alike in placing a decided pause before the couplet.

Three form an octave and sestet (T. 11a, 28b, 301). Two do not seem to be systematically divided (T. 10b, 11b).

That in the sonnets of Surrey we have to do with a form of verse quite unlike Wyatt's is plain. Is the later type developed from the earlier? Certain facts must be observed in the endeavor to answer this question. With one exception, all of Surrey's sonnets are in alternate rhyme. Two of the sonnets have only two rhymes throughout the first twelve lines. One other has but three. In several of the other sonnets the three quatrains have a very slight degree of independence and are separated by very light pauses. In some cases, indeed, the quatrains exist only in the rhyme-scheme and not in fact.

Now, we find in Wyatt many instances of a type of verse-structure in which four or six alternately rhyming lines are followed by a couplet. Surrey likewise affords examples of such forms, and also has written a similar poem of ten lines followed by a couplet ("The sudden storms," N. 80). The rhyme-system is *ababababcc*. Among the poems by "Uncertain Authors" in Totel's Miscellany are one of nine lines, rhyming *ababababcc* (T. 166); of ten, *ababababcc* (T. 177); of seventeen, *abababaccdcdcddee*; besides several of the closely analogous type illustrated in the eleven-line poem, T. 170—*ababa | acac | dd*. Now, there is no difficulty in supposing a fourteen-line poem with but two alternate rhymes in the first twelve lines and a couplet ending to be simply one of the class of six-line, eight-line, ten-line, twelve-line verse-forms constructed on the same principle. The break-up into stanzas, in a language so poor in rhymes as English, would be very natural without any analogy to encourage it; but the existence of the sonnet might well exert an influence on the fourteen-line *strambotto*, if we may call it by that name. The analogy of the sonnet, too, would be likely to make the length of the new form seem preferable to that of the shorter *strambotti*. While we recognize the probable influence of the sonnets of Wyatt in this way, we cannot easily regard them as the direct

sources of the type. The alternation of the rhymes might be explained as due to the analogy of other forms, but the existence of sonnets with only two rhymes in the first twelve lines and no stanza-divisions would appear to be inconsistent with the notion that the Surrey sonnet is a laxer, more fully developed Wyatt sonnet.

The sonnets of Wyatt are in intention, and oftener than not in fact, Italian sonnets after an inferior model; Surrey's sonnets are a new form derived from the *strambotto*.

H. B. LATHROP.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

GERMANIC ETYMOLOGIES.

1. GOTH. *bindan* "binden," OHG. *bintan*, etc., contain a base *bhendh-*, which must have meant primarily "turn, wind, bend," or the like. This meaning is evident from OE. *bendan* "bind; stretch, bend," E. *bend* "biegen, beugen; neigen, krümmen," ON. *benda* "biegen, krümmen; bezwingen; spannen" (einen bogen), *bendla* "verwickeln, entangle, embroil." We may therefore add to the words usually connected with this base Skt. *bandhurā-s* "geneigt, gesenkt, zugetan," whence also "hold, reizend, schön."

Here also perhaps Lat. *fundāre* "fasten, secure, make firm; establish, found." So Skt. *bandhā* "das binden, anbinden; zusammensetzung, errichtung, erbauung."

2. Goth. *bandwa* "zeichen," *bandwjan* "ein zeichen geben," ON. *benda* "winken, ein zeichen geben, anzeigen," *bending* "wink, zeichen, warnung" are properly referred to *bindan* (cf. Schade, *Wörterbuch*, s. v. "bant"). Compare especially the meanings in Skt. *baddhā-s* "gebunden; gehetzt, gerichtet, gezeigt," *bandhā-s* "das binden; aussern, zeigen."

3. With Goth. *jiuka* "streit, zank," *jiukan* "kämpfen" compare MHG. *jöuchen, jouchen* "jagen, treiben," and also Av. *yaozaiti* "bewegt sich, zittert, wallt," Arm. *yuzem* "rege auf," which have been referred to a base *ju-* in Lith. *judū* "rege mich, zittere," Skt. *yūdhyati* "kämpft" (cf. Persson, *Studien*, p. 44).

4. Goth. *-teins*, in *sin-teins* "immerwährend, taglich," has been connected with OIr. *denus* "zeitraum," Skt. *dina-*, Lith. *dēna* "day," etc., and these are referred to a base *dī-* "shine" in Skt. *dīdēti* "shine."

The meaning "shine," however, comes from "turn, whirl, move rapidly" (cf. Prellwitz, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s. v. *δέαται, δίεπαι*), and we may better refer the base **dīno-, *deino-, *doino-*, in G. *-teina-*, etc., to this same primary meaning. So this word meant originally not "brightness" but "period, course, cycle," from an adj. **dīno-* "turning, whirling," etc., from which also

Gk. *δίνως* "whirlpool, eddy," *δινέα* "whirl, spin round, drive; wander," ON. *teinn* "twig, spindle," Goth. *tains*, etc. (cf. author, *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. XIV, p. 334). To the same base, as I have shown (cf. as above, pp. 333 f.), belong OE. *tīd*, *tīma* "time," OHG. *zīla* "zeile," *zilōn* "sich beeilen, eifrig bestreben nach," etc. Compare also Skt. *dīnā-s* "gering, niedergeschlagen, traurig," primarily "turned, bowed down, niedergebeugt."

5. Goth. *triggwus* "treu, zuverlässig," OHG. *triwi*, etc., OE. *trum* "fest, stark, kräftig," ON. *traustr* "fest, stark, sicher," Lith. *drūtas* "fest, stark," Welsh *drut*, *drūd* "stark," Gk. *δρόοντος λοχυπόν* (cf. Schade, *Wörterbuch*, p. 956; Uhlenbeck, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*², p. 147) contain a base *dreu-* "strong, firm," whence "faithful, true." This we may derive from the base in Skt. *drāvati* "läuft, eilt, schmilzt," *drutā-s* "eilend, rasch, geschwind, flüssig." The meaning "strong" comes from "swift" as in MHG. *swinde* "geschwind, ungestüm, heftig, stark;" *snel* "schnell, rasch, gewandt, kraftig, tapfer."

6. ON. *sáttir* "versöhnt," *scétt* "vertrag, versöhnung": OE. *seht* "versöhnt; versöhnung, vertrag, friede, freundschaft," *sehtan* "versöhnen." For other connections see *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. XVIII, p. 16.

7. ON. *skále* "hütte, grosses gemach": *skál*, OS., OHG. *skūla* "trinkschale." Compare Lat. *cūpa* "tonne," Gk. *κύπελλον* "becher": E. *hovel*, MHG. *hobel* "decke, deckel," etc.

8. ON. *sam-eign* "kampf" probably meant "coming together, meeting" and may be compared with Lith. *eigā* "gang," Gk. *οἴχομαι* "go, am gone," *οἴχνεω* "go, come" (cf. Prellwitz, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, p. 221).

9. ON. *pōra* "wagen," *pōran*, "mut," *pōrenn* "mutig, keck" no doubt go back to the meaning "quick, swift." Compare Skt. *turā-s* "rasch," *turāti* "eilt, drängt vorwärts," *tvārate* "eilt," OHG. *dweran* "drehen, rühren," etc.

10. OHG. *fihu* "vieh, vermögen, Goth. *faihu* "vermögen, geld," Lat. *pecu* "cattle," *pecūlium* "private property, savings," *pecūnia* "wealth, money," Skt. *paçū* "vieh," etc., are supposed to come from an IE, base **peku-* "cattle": "property." That is,

"cattle" is supposed to be the earlier idea, from which "property in general" developed. It is altogether more probable, however, that "possession, property" was the earlier meaning, and "cattle" a specialization of this. So we find it in other words: OE. *neōtan* "nehmen, gebrauchen, geniessen," Goth. *niutan* "erlangen, geniessen," Lith. *naudà* "nutzen, ertrag, habe": OHG. *nōz* "nutzvieh, vieg, rindvieh," OE. *nēat* ON. *naut* "rindvieh". Gk. *κτάσις* "erwerbe," *κέκτημα* "besitz": *κτῆμα* "besitz, vermögen," *κτήνη* "vieh."—Lat. *capitale* "capital, property": E. *chattel, cattle*.—E. *stock* "property invested in any business; live stock, cattle," in both senses comparatively recent.—Goth. *skatts* "geldstück, geld," OFries. *sket* "geld, vieg."

It is safe to say, therefore, that IE. **peku-* meant primarily "something acquired, property." This naturally comes from a base *peḱ-* "get, acquire," which may be in Skt. *paç-* "strick," *pāça-s* "schlinge, fessel, strick," *pāçāyati*, Av. *pas-* "binden," Goth. *fāhan* "fangen," *faginōn* "sich freuen" (primarily "geniesen," as in Goth. *niutan* "erlangen, geniessen"), OHG. *gifehan* "sich freuen," *fehōn* "zu sich nehmen, verzehren." This gives us the connection made by Schade, *Wörterbuch*, p. 194, though the development of meaning is differently explained.

This base **pe(n)kā*, which is better separated from *pāk-* in Lat. *pāx*, etc., seems to have meant "draw together, grasp, catch," and to it may also be referred Goth. *figgrs* "finger" (cf. Skeat, *Etmological Dictionary*, s. v. "finger").

11. OHG. *jehan* "sagen, sprechen, aussagen, erklären, behaupten, bejahren, gestehen, beichten," etc., can hardly be connected with *ja*. In that case we should expect a weak verb. Here, however, we have a strong verb with a rich development of meaning, which may be referred to a pre-Germ. **jēgo-*. This we may compare with Skt. *yācati* "fleht, heischt, bittet," and perhaps also Lat. *jacio, jēcī* "throw, cast; emit; utter, declare." The Latin word is nearest the primitive meaning. From this could develop the meanings of the Skt. and of the OHG. words. The latter correspond closely to the derived meanings of *jacio*. Compare also the correspondence between OS. *bigehan* refl. "sich vermessn" and Lat. *se jactere* "boast, vaunt."

12. OHG. *knabo, knappo* "knabe, jüngling, bursche, diener," OS. *knapo*, ON. *knapa*, OE. *cnapa* "knappe, junker," *cnafa* "boy, servant," have often been referred to the IE. base *gen-* "beget." It is more probable, however, that the words meant primarily "chunk," and are connected with OHG. *knebil*, MHG. *knebel* "knebel; knöchel; grober gesell, bengel," ON. *knefell* "pfahl, stock," NHG. (Hess.) *knabe* "stift, bolze" (cf. Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s. v. "Knebel"), ON. *knappr* "knopf, knauf; haufe," OE. *cnaepp* "mountain-top; brooch," i. e., "knob," Sw. *knapp* "knopf, knauf;" "knapp," Pol. *gnabić, gnębić* "drücken" (cf. Zupitza, *Die germanischen Gutturale*, p. 147).

A word with such a primary meaning might designate a person who was a block, stick, chump; a clod, lout; a stumpy fellow, or the like. So in the following, which may be compared, for the development of meaning, with the above.

13. ON. *knýia* "schlagen," *knosa* "schlagen, stossen," Dan. *knuse* "zerdrücken," LG. *knüs'en* "drücken," MHG. *knür(e)*, *knurre* "knuff, stoss; knoten, knorren: grober mensch," *knorre* "knorren: kurzer, dicker mensch," Dan. *knoe* "bursche," NHG. *knorz* "knob, knot: little stumpy fellow," MHG. *knorzen* "balgen, kneten."

14. MHG. *knüllen* "knuffen, stossen," *zerknellen* "zerdrücken, zerquetschen; mit geräusch zerspringen," *erknellen* "erschallen," etc., OE. *cnull* "hill-top, knoll," i. e., "knob, hump," MHG. *knolle* "erdscholle, klumpen: grober, plumper mensch, bauer," Dan. *knold* "knollen, knoten; klumpen: tölpel."

15. MHG. *zer-knürsen* "zerdrücken, zerquetschen," *knirren, knarren*, ME. *knarre* "knot on a tree: short stout man," NHG. *knirps*.

16. Sw. dial. *knöva* "zusammendrücken," ME. *knobbe* "knob"; E. *knuff* "lout, clown," Hess., Mecklenb. *knubs* "knirps."

17. OHG. *kneht* "knabe, bursche, mann, knappe, held," OE. *cniht* "boy, attendant," may also go back to a similar meaning. Compare OSw. *knaekker*, Norw. dial. *knekk* "stoss," MHG., NHG. *knacken*, MLG. *knagge* "knob, thick piece," ME. *knagg*; E. *knag* "hook, peg; protuberant knot," etc.

The fundamental meaning in all these groups is, "press, crush," from which comes "knob, knot, bunch," etc., and "crash, crack, creak," etc.

18. MHG. *līp* "leib, körper, magen" is probably not the same word as *līp* "leben." The former I should refer to a pre-Germ. **libho-s* or **leibho-s* and connect with Lith. *lāibas* "schlank." Compare Skt. *tanū-s* "dtinn, schmächtig": *tanū-s*, Av. *tanu-* "leib, körper." The word probably first meant "side, flank," and then, like Lat. *latus*, "body."

19. OHG. *sumar* "sommer," Skt. *sáma* "jahr," Av. *ham-* "sommer," Gk. *ἡμέρα* "tag" may be referred to Gk. *ἡμέρος* "sanft, mild," Ir. *sám* "ruhe," OHG. *semfti* "sanft," ON. *sama, sóma* "passen," Goth. *samjan* "gefallen," base **sáṃ-*, which I should separate from Goth. *sama*, Gk. *όμος* "same," base **somo-* (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*², p. 127).

20. OS. *tōgian*, OHG. *zougen* "zeigen," etc., have long been connected with Goth. *at-augjan*. Another connection, which seems to me altogether more probable, is to refer the words to MHG. *ziugen* "verfertigen, anschaffen; zeugen, erzeugen; zeugnis ablegen, bezeugen, beweisen." This explanation, which is also an old one (cf. Graff, 5, 614; Schade, *Wörterbuch*, p. 1297), presupposes a Germ. **taugjan* "producere," a causative of Goth. *tiuhan*, OHG. *ziohan*, etc. In form and meaning nothing stands in the way of this combination.

21. Am. E. *flax* "beat," *flax round* "move about in a lively or energetic manner," prov. E. *flaxen* "beat or thrash," are connected in the *Century Dictionary* with *flax* "flachs," "in allusion to the beating of flax." These words, however, are rather to be connected with Sw. *flaxa* "mit den flügeln schlagen, flattern," Norw. *flaksa* "flattern," which, according to Tamm, *Etymologisk Ordbook*, p. 150, are formed with an s-suffix from the base in OE. *flacor* "flying," *flicerian* "flutter," MHG. *slackern* "flackern," Sw. *flacka*, etc.

Or we may connect *flax*, Sw. *flaxa*, etc., with Goth. *þlahsjan* "erschrecken," *gaþlahsnan* "erschrocken werden," Ch. Sl. *tlükq*, *tlěsti* "schlagen," etc. (cf. Grienberger, *Gotische Wortkunde*, p. 216; author, *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. XVI, col. 311).

22. E. *wishbone* "furcula, gabelbein" looks like a compound of *wish* and *bone*, and it is true that this bone is often used in wishing. But this practice is probably recent and may have grown up after the word took its present form. This is probably a corruption of **withbone*, perhaps made over from ON. *vidbein* "schlüsselbein," with which compare OE. *wipobān* "shoulder-blade."

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

SOME COMMENTS ON THE SOURCES OF CHAUCER'S "PARDONER'S TALE."

In the volume of the "Publications of the Chaucer Society" entitled *Originals and Analogues* there are two contributions containing many versions of the story in Chaucer's "Pardoner's Tale" and among them an English rendering of what seems to be the ultimate source. This is the Vedabbha *Jātaka*¹ from the famous Buddhist collection of birth-stories dating from between 400 and 250 B. C. The tale runs in this fashion: Vedabbha, a brahmin who knows a spell to call down wealth from heaven, sets out with his pupil Bodhisattva—the future Buddha. On the way the five hundred Sending thieves capture them and justify their name by sending Bodhisattva for a ransom. He warns the brahmin not to use his spell, lest destruction follow, and departs. The brahmin, nevertheless, calls down the wealth. Now five hundred other thieves make the Sending thieves their prisoners, and slay them and the brahmin with them. Then, dividing among themselves, they kill two hundred and fifty of their number, and so on, until, as a result of this arithmetical warfare, only two are left. These carry off the wealth; one goes to the village for rice, poisons it, and returning is slain by the other, who eats the rice and dies. The Bodhisattva comes back to find the wealth scattered about, then the body of the brahmin, afterward the five hundred dead thieves, the two hundred and fifty, and so on, until he comes upon the last two, the poisoned and the slain. He repeats a fitting moral sentiment, and so the *Jātaka* concludes. So much of the story is necessary to explain other versions, and the resemblance to the "Pardoner's Tale" is already clear. The plot is easily reduced to two essentials: *x*, the virtuous man who warns, and *yy*, a group of characters who carry through the poisoning story. In the history of this tale these two elements will be found to remain surprisingly constant, and even such details as the appended moral to appear again and again.

¹ No. 48 in FAUSBÖLL's edition of the Pali text of the *Jātaka* book.

The popularity of this story is attested by many eastern versions, but for this inquiry only heirs in the European line need to be considered. The first is a Persian story¹ from a twelfth-century poem of Ferdu'-d-Din 'Attár, and may be called the first Persian story. In its significant episodes Jesus tempts with a mound of gold an evil man to confess a sin. The man confesses and is left with the gold. Two men find him there, and from here on the three represent the *yy* group of the Buddhist tale, and carry through the poisoning story. After the tragedy Jesus returns to pronounce the moral. This tale has a close analogue in Arabic, and the first part at least, as will be hereafter seen, passed into European literature. This first part, the story of Jesus and the evil man, is the new element, and must be set down as a contamination of the old story by a tale from an unknown source. The second Persian version¹ is simpler. The *yy* group appear, find the gold, and play their part, and Christ and the disciples pass by to take the part of *x*. This story also has a close parallel in Arabic, this time in the *Supplementary Arabian Nights*. It seems to have passed with little change into Europe, for novella 83 of the *Cento novelle antiche* of the edition of Gualteruzzi is the same tale, with slight changes of detail. This plot probably represents a simplification of the old Buddhist story, into which Christ has been introduced through the influence of the first Persian story. Or we can, for influence here, call upon another eastern story from the *Avadānas*, in which Buddha with a companion find much gold and many precious things. Buddha says, "Behold a venomous serpent;" but the man, tempted by the treasure, carries it home and perishes through the cupidity of his king. We have too little data to do more than indicate some of the ingredients which may have gone into the general solution.

The Italian story just mentioned has many lineal descendants, but it cannot be the immediate source of the "Pardoner's Tale." A story which has more right to such a claim is printed in the *Originals and Analogues* from the edition of the *Cento novelle antiche* edited by Borghini in 1572. A hermit finds a treasure,

¹ See W. A. CLOUSTON, in *Originals and Analogues* ("Publications of the Chaucer Society").

calls it death, and, fleeing from it, meets the group *yy*. These take their usual course, and the story ends with a moral sentiment. But Italian scholars have shown that Borghini is not the originator of this form of the story. He drew his material from two sources¹ —the Gualteruzzi edition of 1525, and a manuscript called Panciatichiano-Palatino 138, whose stories Bartoli, D'Ancona, and other scholars assign to a date only slightly later than the manuscript from which Gualteruzzi must have drawn. The Codex Panciatichiano-Palatino, which I shall hereafter designate as C. P., must have been written before the latter half of the fourteenth century, and is probably of the thirteenth century, while some of the stories are probably earlier.² *Novella* 149 of this collection is the same as *novella* 82 Borghini, with this slight difference: Borghini edited his work at a time of reaction from religious influences. As a result, the *santo romito*, or holy hermit, of C. P. 149 becomes merely *romito* in his version, and the moral sentiment which in C. P. has to do with the saving of the soul is softened into a merely prudent warning. We have, therefore, proof of the existence of a story almost identical with Chaucer's in an accessible manuscript of a period considerably anterior to that of the "Pardoner's Tale." But if we assume for a minute that this is the immediate source, or near to it, there is still a question to be answered before we can trace the line back to the East. By what alchemy have the Christ and his disciples of Gualteruzzi and the second Persian versions been transmuted into a wandering hermit fleeing from death?

First be it noted that the Codex Panciatichiano-Palatino consists of two parts originally independent,³ the first part being taken from the source of Gualteruzzi's edition, with slight variations and additions, the second part consisting of more *novelle* from this source, some duplicated, others lengthened, and new ones from other sources added. In the first part occurs *novella*

¹ See GUIDO BIAGI, *Le novelle antiche dei codici Panciatichiano-Palatino* (1880), pp. 138 ff.

² See BARTOLI, *I primi due secoli della letteratura italiana* pp. 284 f.; D'ANCONA, "Del novellino e delle sue fonti," *Studi di critica e storia letteratura* (1890), p. 217.

³ See BIAGI, *op. cit.*, pp. cxxv ff.; BARTOLI, *Storia della letteratura*, Vol. III, pp. 190 ff., and ADOLF GASPARY, *History of Early Italian Literature to the Death of Dante*, p. 164.

83 of Gualteruzzi, here *novella* 120; that is, the Christ type of our story. *Novella* 149 in the second part is the hermit version of the story and the version which Borghini borrowed. As Biagi points out for the two texts in general, here, indeed, are two versions meeting for the first time.

The hermit version of this story is found in only one of the surviving collections of stories which are earlier than the time of Chaucer. In the latter portion of an Italian miracle-play of the fifteenth century, entitled *Rappresentazione di Sant' Antonio*,¹ there is, however, a plot which bears upon the point in question. St. Antony, wandering through the desert on his way to become a hermit, is tempted, first by a silver dish, and then by a mound of gold. He leaves the gold, and, meeting two robbers, warns them to turn back from the death in their way. They are joined by a third robber, disregard the warning, and go through the old poisoning story, with an angel at the end to take the part of *x*. As D'Ancona says, and as a perusal of the play shows, this poisoning story seems to have only an artificial connection with the amplified legend to which it is joined. As a matter of fact, the Antony of the temptation is the famous St. Antony, the "glorioso e santissimo abate Anton d'Egitto, famoso eremita," as the original miracle-play has it. Furthermore, this same story of the temptation may be found in his life in the works of Athanasius (fourth century), and in *The Lives of the Fathers*. Clouston's statement that this story refers to St. Antony of Padua, a famous preacher, has therefore no authority. So much for the story of St. Antony; but, to quote from D'Ancona's introduction to the play: "The episode of the thieves is an addition to the legend made by the poet, or, as is more probable, by the popular tradition which the poet was then reproducing." Consider the names and actions of the three thieves, and the assertion that this is an old and well-known story becomes even better founded. Scaramuccia is one; Carapello is another; Tagliagambe, the third. Scaramuccia is merely the familiar Neapolitan mask character, the braggart who figures so prominently in the *commedia dell' arte* which was soon to take a literary form. The other two I have not been

¹ A. D'ANCONA, *Sacre Rappresentazioni*.

able to place among the hosts of stock figures who played parts in the early comedy, but their names and actions leave little doubt of their character. The early *commedia dell' arte* certainly influenced the miracle-play,¹ and this kind of comedy was in full flower in the second half of the fifteenth century.² Here, then, we have one of its most popular and most ancient figures, adding, as was the custom, the humor of his well-known character to the interest of an old story.

The latter part of this miracle-play, therefore, quite certainly represents an old story worked into his narrative by the author, in order to relieve the didactic portions by the presence of dearly loved and generally comic characters. This story represents a fusion of the legend of St. Antony with the poisoning story of Buddhist origin. Such a fusion might have come about in two ways. The story of Christ tempting the Jew with the mound of gold is found in slightly altered guise in the Codex Panciatichiano and in Gualteruzzi, dissociated from the poisoning tale which accompanies it in the eastern versions. Other versions of this story "correvano fra il volgo" circulated among the common people, as D'Ancona shows. In all versions from the East, where it had its origin, it is, however, associated with the poisoning story. It is, therefore, not improbable that the story containing both these elements, as in the first Persian and first Arabian stories, came over whole, as well as in parts, and might easily confuse its temptation story with that of St. Antony, the resulting tale being the source of the latter part of the miracle-play. Or the tale that is found in Gualteruzzi's edition (83) and as C. P. 120—that is, the story which brings in Christ and his disciples—might suffer a like contamination. The gold that Christ's disciples find, and leave because they are warned that it means death to the soul, would suggest to some narrator the mound of gold which Antony, too, knew meant destruction and from which he fled, and thus the tale would be enriched by a more popular introduction. At all events, there is such a combination in the miracle-play, and there is every reason to suppose that an earlier tale preceded it. This is the more probable because by the very

¹ See BARTOLI, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

² SCHERILLO, *La Commedia dell' arte in Italia*.

easy change from St. Antony, who was a hermit and has always been particularly connected with hermits, to *santo romito*, or "holy hermit," and the omission of the duplicate incident of the silver dish, both changes tending toward simplification, we have the hermit story of C. P. 149 and can account for a reading of the old story which before this is found nowhere else and can be accounted for in no other way.

It is now time to take up Chaucer's "Pardoner's Tale," the English version of this story. Only a careful study of the preceding narratives can bring one to a full appreciation of the exquisite art displayed by the English poet in the narrative portion of this tale; for it is not all narrative. Ll. 463-82 and 661-894 make up the story proper; the rest is exposition and argument, very good of the kind, but segregated so as not to interfere with the rapid action of the tale itself.

In Flaundres whilom was a compaignye
Of yonge folk, that haunteden folye,

Chaucer begins, and tells how they were "riotours," and how "Oure blissed Lordes body they to-tere." After a long digression, these "yonge folk" are suddenly specified as three, and the story moves forward. They learn that one of their companions has been seized by death, and, seeking this "false traytour death," they meet an old man looking for Death, who will not have him. "Up this crooked wey—I lafte hym," the old man says, and under a tree they find "Of floryns fyne—wel ny a seven bussheles." From now on the incidents are those of the familiar poisoning story, worked out with far more realistic detail than ever before, and concluding with a moral of the same purport as that of the Italian version. The hermit, be it observed, becomes an old man who seeks death instead of fleeing it; but, except for this change, and the elaborated introduction, there is nothing in the plot of Chaucer's poem which materially differs from that of the Italian story C. P. 149, whose origin has just been explained.

This introduction (ll. 463-82), beginning "In Flaundres whilom was a compaignye," has no very direct connection with the rest of the narrative. The description of the riotous living, the "wafereres," and the "tombesteres," has some bearing upon the

sermon which immediately follows it, but none upon the development of the story in ll. 661-894. It is picturesque and characteristic, and there seems to be no reason why it should not be supposed an addition of Chaucer's, imaginative or otherwise, put in as a text upon which to expand his exposition that follows. Some such beginning is necessary in order to give this sermon its greatest cogency and aptest reference to the story. The mention of "Flaundres" may point to an original *fabliau*, but may, too, have come out of Chaucer's brain, put in, perhaps, because of the popular idea of the Flemish as a drinking race.¹ Note, too, in this connection that in ll. 475 and 482 of the narrative introduction Chaucer is quoting his own "Parson's Tale," as he does again in the expository portion, but not in the story proper, which, if "The" be substituted for "Thise" in l. 661, "Thise riotours thre of which I speke," and the last clause of this line be omitted, would need no introduction to make it complete. There is no question as to the provenance of the sermon on gluttony and other vices which intervenes between the introduction and this narrative proper, particularly as this expository section contains matter probably quoted from Chaucer's lost translation of Innocent's "De Contemptu Mundi," and more from his own "Parson's Tale,"² and is certainly derived from no source connected in any way with the old poisoning story.

Ll. 661-765 of the "Pardoner's Tale" contain the very beautiful story of the old man whom death will not have, and in the complete story which lies in ll. 661-894 these show the only substantial change from the plot of C. P. 149. This should be Chaucer's own, as far as the handling is concerned, and not only on account of its characteristic style; for a classic source (first elegy of Maximian) seems to have been found by Professor Kittredge for the famous lines beginning "And on the ground which is my moodres gate I knocke."³ Ten Brink has suggested an influence which surely cannot account for the meeting with the old man, but which may have affected the underlying idea and some of the details of this passage. He thinks that there

¹ See notes in SKEAT's edition.

² See notes in SKEAT's edition.

³ See notes in SKEAT's edition.

may be a fusion here with the story of the Wandering Jew. Our first record of this story in English is through Roger de Wendover's *Flowers of History*, which forms the first part of Matthew of Paris's *Chronicle* (1259). Here the man condemned to wait for Christ is "one who is well practised in sorrow." In later versions he is a wanderer from land to land, always wishing for Death, who will not have him. In English the story gets into the ballads,¹ and is well known in folklore.² It was so widely spread over Europe in later times that it seems most probable that Chaucer was familiar with some form of the legend. If it exists in some form which may be sufficiently old, containing such details as the search of the wanderer for someone who will "chaunge his youthe for myn age," it will seem very probable that Chaucer enriched the story of the wandering hermit by the memory of such a legend, or, less probably, got his whole story from some source where such an enriching had already taken place. If no such version exists, we can only say that such lines as the question asked of the old man, "Why livestow so longe in so greet age?" his assertion, "And therefore moot I han myn age stille, As longe tyme as it is Goddes wille," and particularly the similarity of the ideas underlying this portion of Chaucer's work and the famous legend, make out a possible explanation of Chaucer's improvement upon the Italian story. As he would have concluded, "ther is namore to say."

And now to sum up. Chaucer's story may be divided for convenience into four parts: an introduction treating of certain "yonge folk" in "Flaundres," a didactic digression, an account of the meeting with the old man whose life Death will not have, and the story proper of the three "riotours" who come to death through murder and poisoning. The introduction, in spite of a hypothetical, and improbable, *fabliau*, may safely be assumed to be Chaucer's, the sermon is undoubtedly of his own working, the episode of the old man may be influenced by the legend of the Wandering Jew, but is certainly based upon the account of the

¹ See PERCY'S *Reliques*.

² *Folk-lore of the Northern Counties* (published by Folk-Lore Society, 1879), p. 82; see also *The Wandering Jew Telling Fortunes to Englishmen* (1640) — a satire.

santo romito in the Italian story. The story proper is merely the amplification of the considerably earlier tale C. P. 149, or one closely resembling it, which would represent such a version as Gualteruzzi 83, modified by fusion with that part of the widespread legend of St. Antony which treats of his adventures on his way to become a hermit. It is possible, however, and probable, that while this explanation holds good, we still have not the immediate source of Chaucer's tale. The probability of the fusion of the St. Antony legend with the poisoning story is partly based upon the joining of these two in a fifteenth-century miracle-play. But there are some rather striking similarities between this play and Chaucer's version, which do not appear when the latter is compared with C. P. 149. Chaucer's villain buys poison that he "may his rattes quelle," while Scaramuccia asks for poison to kill rats which have grown so bold that they gnaw his ears. There is nothing said about rats in C. P. 149. There is another similarity which is still more to the point. After Scaramuccia has gone for the food and drink, the two remaining thieves in the play plan his destruction. One offers to tell to the other a thought which has come to him, if he will swear to tell no one of it, if it does not please him. The other has a like thought, which he will tell on promise of secrecy. The first then points out that the treasure would be much greater if divided between two, rather than among three. This thought pleases the second thief, who counsels that they assault Scaramuccia when he returns and seats himself. Now, if this be compared with the passage in Chaucer contained in ll. 806-34, all the important points of the Italian dialogue will be found duplicated, even to the manner of killing; for Chaucer makes his rascal say, "Looke whan that he is set, and right anoon Arys," etc. Add to this the passage just preceding, ll. 793-805, where the thieves draw cuts to see who shall go to town, precisely as they do in the miracle-play, although there is no mention of such a proceeding in C. P. 149, and the probability of another version current at the same time, but, like "The Pardoner's Tale," more amplified than C. P. 149, must be admitted. This version, which we may assume to have been Chaucer's immediate source, must have been

just the story that the author of the miracle-play used, with the simplification of the St. Antony portion carried out as we find in C. P. 149. That is, it would be a story of a wandering hermit who flies from death in the shape of gold, and the following action of three thieves in a form somewhat more amplified than that of the Italian story which we possess, and closer in detail to the narrative of Chaucer. The Italian story we possess, C. P. 149, is merely another reading, which happens to have been preserved. It is obviously improbable that Chaucer's rendering could have returned to Italy and influenced the dramatic form.

And therefore we may quite safely assume that an Italian story, whose approximate form we possess in C. P. 149, was in the original, or translation, Chaucer's immediate source. But we have accounted for the form of this story in the preceding pages, and so we may trace our line surely back to the East, and probably through the Arabic to the Persian. There, to make a final summary, we find a form of the story, the first Persian, which seems to lie in the direct path of ascent. In it we have a union of two tales. One is the Christ and the evil man story of unknown origin; the other comes directly from the *Jātaka* book, and will probably never be traced farther.

I will take one paragraph more to call attention to an interesting analogue of "The Pardoner's Tale" which does not seem to have been noticed. Kipling's *First Jungle Book* contains the story—one of his best—of "The King's Ankus." Mowgli goes to the old city Cold Lairs with Kaa, the python. There they find a vast treasure in an underground chamber, guarded by a cobra. Mowgli takes a ruby-headed ankus, and is warned by the cobra that it will cause death. He tires of it and throws it away. The next night, with Bagheera, the panther, he follows the trail of a man who has carried it off. First they find a villager slain by the arrow of a Gond, who has disappeared with the ankus; then the body of the Gond, and the trail of three men. After a little while they come upon the dead body of one of them, and a little farther on the corpses of the others, the ankus beside them, and on the dead fire the remnant of a poisoned loaf. Here is the old poisoning story again, and it seems most probable that this

particular plot was found in India and goes back by eastern steps. For it is interesting to see that it seems to preserve the trailing of the Bodhisattva, in which he found first the dead brahmin, then the five hundred dead thieves, then the two hundred and fifty, and so on to the two last, one slain in the bush, the other poisoned beside the wealth. Next to Chaucer's, Kipling's telling of the story is the best, but for rapidity of narration, vividness, and beauty the poet wins easily among all this host of competitors.

HENRY SEIDEL CANBY.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

BL

R
an
to
dr
pro
ha
cur
ha
in
asc
ela
Jon
Ar
has
in
phy
in
rev
in
oth
allo
fici
Our
of
rev
be
writ
tinc
poi
den
at
489]

BEN JONSON'S PROBABLE AUTHORSHIP OF SCENE 2,
ACT IV, OF FLETCHER'S "BLOODY BROTHER."

THE powerful tragedy of *The Bloody Brother*, on the story of Rollo, Duke of Normandy, is printed in the works of Beaumont and Fletcher as their joint production, but is universally admitted to be one of the plays in which Beaumont had no share. The drama, nevertheless, is not generally supposed to be the unassisted production of Fletcher. His collaborator is usually believed to have been Ben Jonson, a theory strongly accredited by the circumstance of the first edition of the drama, printed in 1639, having borne upon the title-page the initials B. J. F.; although in the next edition, published in the following year, the piece is ascribed to Fletcher alone. A considerable share in it has been claimed for Massinger; Mr. Fleay and Professor Herford confine Jonson's participation to the second scene of the fourth act. Mr. Arthur Bullen, whose standard edition of Beaumont and Fletcher has not yet reached *The Bloody Brother*, thus gives his opinion in his article on Fletcher in the *Dictionary of National Biography*: "A plausible view is that *The Bloody Brother* was written in the first instance by Fletcher and Jonson, and that it was revised by Massinger on occasion of its revival at Hampton Court in January 1636-7." We do not propose to inquire whether other scenes may be traced to Jonson's hand besides the one allowed to be his by Fleay and Herford, or whether there is sufficient reason for attributing any part of the piece to Massinger. Our object is to strengthen the evidence for Jonson's authorship of the second scene of the fourth act, by showing that this scene reveals an erudition greater than any contemporary dramatist can be supposed to have possessed. Milton, it will be remembered, writing in rare Ben's lifetime, picks out learning as his most distinctive quality: "If Jonson's learned sock be on." We shall point out cogent—we do not say absolutely indisputable—evidence of the writer's acquaintance with an ancient Latin drama at that time known to very few. We shall also signalize the

remarkable exactness of his acquaintance with astrology. Alone among the poets—Dryden and professional astrologers excepted—who have handled this theme, he seems to have been thoroughly versed in the subject.

The ancient Latin play which has been referred to as probably known to the writer of the scene in *The Bloody Brother* ascribed to Ben Jonson, is one which before Jonson's time existed in printed shape in only two editions, but in 1619 became accessible to anyone who should provide himself, as Ben probably would, with the last and best edition of Plautus. It is the anonymous *Querolus*, or *Aulularia*, first published by Danielis in 1564, republished by Rittershusius in 1595, and printed for the third time in 1619 by Pareus at the end of his edition of Plautus. In the nineteenth century the play has been edited in 1829 by Klinkhamer, who restored it to its original metrical form, and since by Peiper, and in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études* by Havet, who has supplied a French prose translation. It is also the subject of a most entertaining essay, with translated specimens, in the *Horae dramaticae* of Thomas Love Peacock, which originally appeared in *Fraser's Magazine*, and is reprinted in Sir Henry Cole's and the present writer's editions of Peacock's works.

The *Querolus* is a remarkable relic of antiquity, the sole witness to the existence of a Latin drama during the later ages of the empire. From its mention of *solidi*, first coined under Constantine, it would appear not to be earlier than that emperor. It also appears from internal evidence to have been written during the commotions excited in Gaul by the Bagaudae, but as these continued more than a century, this testimony is deficient in chronological precision. The particularity of the reference, however, countenances the conjecture that the play was written in Gaul, where, throughout the fourth century, literature was active, if hardly to be called flourishing. If, as has been deemed, a passage of singular obscurity is to be understood as a veiled satire upon the rapacity and venality of high officials, this might denote that the play was written at a time when an emperor commonly resided in Gaul; while the attitude of unquestioning faith in the

old religion might induce us to place it as early in the fourth century as possible. Perhaps the reign of Constans (337-50 A. D.) would be a probable date.

Without pretensions to poetry, originality, or subtlety in the delineation of character, *Querolus* is an excellent little play, throughout lively, clever, and amusing. Like the *Aulularia* of Plautus, after which it is sometimes incorrectly entitled, it takes its plot from the idea of a treasure buried in a house and unknown to the occupant, but has no other affinity to that play except that the prologue of both is spoken by the tutelary deity, the *lar familiaris*, who expounds the situation, and foreshadows the action of the piece. Euclio, the father of Querolus, has buried a treasure in his house, unknown to his son. Dying abroad, he has intrusted the secret to his friend Mandrogerus, and given the latter a letter empowering him to claim half as a reward for revealing the treasure to Querolus. Mandrogerus, however, a knave not entirely destitute of redeeming qualities, determines to obtain the whole, and is introduced near the beginning of the drama plotting to this end with two other rogues, Sycophanta and Sardanapalus. Here the resemblance to *The Bloody Brother* comes in. The tragic element in that powerful but generally gloomy play is relieved by a comic episode, the humors of a mendacious crew of vagabond astrologers and fortune-tellers, whom the villain of the piece renders necessary to his designs. The scene (Act IV, scene 2) attributed to Ben Jonson represents these worthies in conclave, deplored their impecunious condition and the hardness of the times, and indirectly exposing and castigating their own rascality with abundant *vis comica*. This is the exact counterpart of the scene in the *Querolus*, where the worthlessness of the interlocutors is humorously exhibited by themselves, save that the affluent genius of the English poet has made him exuberant where the Latin dramatist is content with few and simple touches.

In *The Bloody Brother* the knaves are introduced discussing their affairs *en petit comité*:

Fiske: Come, we are stark naught all; bad is the best of us;
Four of the seven deadly spots we are:

Besides our lechery, we are envious,
And most, most glutinous when we have it thus,
Most covetous when we want it; then our boy,
He is a fifth spot, sloth, and he undoes us.

The boy, Pippeau, turns around smartly upon his accuser, and in defending himself lays bare still more of the iniquities of the brotherhood. The conversation continues in this strain until a sudden turn is given to it and to the fortunes of the interlocutors by the entry of Latorche, who sees his way to make them instruments in affairs of state. The idea of the corresponding scene in the *Querolus* is substantially the same, but the management is different. Mandrogerus and his satellites have devised a scheme for obtaining the treasure, in pursuance of which the arch-rogue keeps in the background, and the accomplices fall into conversation respecting the preternatural skill of an almost omniscient magus, to wit, Mandrogerus himself, in such fashion as to be overheard by Querolus, as he issues from his house disposed to credit anything supernatural, in consequence of the conversation he has been holding with the domestic spirit, his family *lar*, who has greatly mystified him by ambiguous prophecies, all of which, however, come true. Overhearing, as it is intended he should, the conversation of the minor knaves, he expresses a desire to be made acquainted with its marvelous subject, the wonder-working magician, whom they represent as a personal stranger, only known to them by his reputation. At this moment Mandrogerus opportunely appears, pacing in a brown study. Summoned to give a test of his skill, he proceeds to expose the iniquities of Sycophanta and Sardanapalus, with whom he is supposed to be unacquainted, just as the fortune-tellers show one another up in *The Bloody Brother*. We give a portion of the scene in Peacock's version:

Mand. : I know none of you three
By any previous knowledge.

Sard. : That is certain.

Mand. : First, then, to thee. Thy name is Sardanapalus:
Poor and low-born.

Sard. : "Tis so.

Mand. : A poor man's child,
Mocked with a royal name.

Sard.: I can't deny it.
Mand.: An idler and a glutton: petulant:
 Calamitous thyself, and a calamity
 To all who know thee.
Sard.: Eh! Mandrogerus.
 I did not ask thee to proclaim my vices.
Mand.: I may not lie. What hast thou more to ask?
Sard.: I have heard too much already. If thou hast
 Aught more, reserve it for my private hearing.
Syc.: Now to my turn, Mandrogerus, tell my fortune,
 So much of it as may be good: no more.
Mand.: I must begin from the beginning. Thou
 Art Sycophanta, and of noble birth.
Syc.: 'Tis true.
Mand.: A worthless subject from the first.
Syc.: Alas!
Mand.: Pressed down by wrongs, compassed by perils
 From steel, and fire, and water.
Syc.: It would seem
 That thou hadst lived with me.
Mand.: Nought of thine own¹
 Is left to thee, but much of other men's.
Syc.: Too much, too much. Pray favour me no further.

Querolus is now eager to make trial of the magician, who seems to be fully justifying the encomiums which he has heard, or, as he erroneously deems, overheard, from the conversation of Sardanapalus and Sycophanta:

I have known magi and astrologers;
 But never one like this. Soon as he sees you
 He calls you by your name: expounds your parents,
 Slaves, family: the history of your life:
 All you have done, and will do.

The rogues in *The Bloody Brother* similarly endeavor to impress Latorche with a fitting sense of the pre-eminence of their wizard:

Rusee: We shall hardly draw
 Him from his chair.
Latorche: Tell him he shall have gold.
Fiske: O, such a syllable would make him forswear
 Ever to breathe in your sight.
Latorche: How, man?

¹ *Aes alienum.*

Fiske:

Sir, he,
If you do please to give him anything,
Must have it conveyed under a paper,

Rusee: Or left behind some book in his study, or in some old wall

Fiske: Where his familiars

May tell him of it, and that pleases him, sir.

Ben Jonson is embroidering a rich humor upon the simple tissue of the old dramatist. His astrology also is more accurate than that of his predecessor, whose acquaintance with the science was probably limited to its terms of art. Mandrogerus, the better to overawe Querolus, professes to cast his horoscope—a sheer impossibility if he were not informed of the time of birth:

Mand.: Mars now is trigon. Saturn looks to Venus.

Jupiter is quadrate. Mercury is wroth with him.

The sun is round. The moon is in her spring.¹

I have combined thy genealogy.

This is little better than jargon, and could at most only have described what astrologers term a horary figure. It is no doubt quite good enough for Querolus, to whom a horary figure and a nativity are all one. The writer of the scene in *The Bloody Brother*, although, as we cannot but think, reminiscent of the passage, goes to work in a much more scientific manner. It is remarkable how little knowledge of astrology has really been possessed by the writers who have made imaginative use of it. Scott, in his *Guy Mannering*, gets away from the subject as quickly as he can; and Schiller and George Eliot, though introducing personages supposed to be not merely astrologers, but expositors and vindicators of astrology, put nothing into their mouths but strings of vague generalities. Not so Fletcher's coadjutor in *The Bloody Brother*; if not an astrologer himself, he has at all events got the subject up most thoroughly. The duke's geniture being shown to the principal astrologer, with whom we have already been made acquainted as one objecting to receive gold unless deposited by familiar spirits behind his books or in a hole in the wall, but who is as well versed in the fundamental maxims of his mystery as he is unprincipled in the application of them, he exclaims:

¹ Increasing in light.

Norb.: I see it; see the planets,
Where, how they are disposed; the Sun and Mercury,
Mars with the Dragon's tail in the third house,
And Pars Fortunae in the Imo Coeli,
Then Jupiter in the twelfth, the Cacodaemon.

The geniture nocturnal, longitude
At twenty-one degrees, the latitude
At forty-nine and ten minutes. How are the Cardines?

Fiske: Libra in twenty-four, forty-four minutes.

Not only is the technical language of astrology accurately preserved, but the latitude and longitude of Caen, where the duke's birth took place, are given with entire correctness, the latter being reckoned from the meridian of Hierro, one of the Canary Islands, as it usually was in Ben Jonson's time. The fact that it would not be so reckoned at the time of the action of *The Bloody Brother* would not disturb a Jacobean dramatist. All the professional talk among the astrologers is equally correct in its employment of terms of art and its references to Arabian astrological authorities, "Messahalah, Zael,¹ or Alkindus." It seems to us unlikely that this erudition was merely got up for the occasion. Much less would have amply served the purposes of the stage. The author was as well acquainted with astrology as (if indeed, as we trust we have rendered probable, he knew the obscure *Querolus*), he must have been with classical literature. There is no dramatist of the age in whom such various knowledge is so likely to have been combined as Ben Jonson, whose authorship of this admirable scene, which bears few traces of Fletcher's peculiar versification, is probable on other grounds.

We have not considered the question whether any other scenes in the play should be attributed to Jonson. It will no doubt be examined by Mr. Bullen. Nor need we follow out the action of the *Querolus*, except by the assurance that the denouement is entirely agreeable to poetical justice.

R. GARNETT.

LONDON.

¹All editions read *Lael*; but this name occurs nowhere else; while *Zael* or *Sael* was a distinguished Arabian astrologer whose works were translated into Latin. The correction was made a few years ago by a correspondent of the *Athenaeum*.

ON
C
D

THE
d'Aven
twelfth
this per
of Lou
control
church
nance o
and Ch
cient in
centuries
Council
ordained
For all
church
church

¹ Prof
between t
wrote *Le
cation Pr
Français*,

² Cf. L
l'ancien d

³ For
(Boston, 18
fully one-h
spiritual p

⁴ In 12
vincialium
sit in trib
speciale
cum matr
competen
mentum o

⁵ Cf. I
medieval
ruptias by
497]

ON THE FORMS OF BETROTHAL AND WEDDING CEREMONIES IN THE OLD-FRENCH *ROMANS* *D'AVENTURE.*

"Amurs n'est pruz, se n'est égals."—*Equitan*, v. 141.

HISTORICAL SURVEY.

THE compositions, known in French literature as *Romans d'Aventure*, flourished at a time dating from the last quarter of the twelfth to the closing decades of the thirteenth century.¹ During this period, of which the greatest part was occupied by the reign of Louis IX, the Roman Church succeeded finally to supreme control of the jurisdiction of marriage.² From a stage where the church had to depend upon the civil authority for the maintenance of religious discipline such as was administered under Pepin and Charlemagne³ to a stage where the church became all-sufficient in matters of its own government, represents a space of five centuries. At the end of this period came the fourth Lateran Council where publicity of the marriage ceremony was definitely ordained and the institution of banns was fixed by canonical law.⁴ For all this, a marriage contracted without the benediction of the church possessed entire validity, as a civil contract, though the church looked upon such unions with a frown.⁵

¹ Professor F. M. Warren sets the period of excellence of the *Romans d'Aventure* between the years 1190 and 1250 A. D., although, as he suggests, Philippe de Beaumanoir wrote *La Manékin* and *Blonde d'Oxford* after the latter date; cf. *Modern Language Association Proceedings*, Vol. II, p. xvii (Baltimore, 1887). Cf. also G. PARIS, *Manuel d'ancien Français*, §§ 51 and 65-68 (Paris, 1890).

² Cf. L. BEAUCHET, *Étude historique sur les formes de la célébration du mariage dans l'ancien droit français* (Paris, 1888), p. 14.

³ For the relation of church to state under Charlemagne cf. ALLEN, *Christian History* (Boston, 1883), Second Period, Vol. I, p. 11: "Of Charlemagne's capitularies or imperial laws, fully one-half may be set down as dealing with matters that . . . belong purely to the spiritual power."

⁴ In 1215 A. D.; cf. the ruling of the church in *Conciliorum omnium generalium et provincialium collectio regia* (Paris, 1644), Vol. XXVIII, p. 204: "Cum inhibitis copulae coniugalis sit in tribus gradibus revocata, eam in aliis volumus distincte observari. . . . Quare specialem quorundam locorum consuetudinem ad alia generaliter prorogando statuimus ut, cum matrimonia fuerint contrahenda, in ecclesiis per presbyteros publice proponantur, competenti termino praefinito ut infra illum qui voluerit et valuerit legitimum impedimentum opponat."

⁵ Cf. E. DUMÉRIL, *Études d'archéologie et d'histoire littéraire* (Paris, 1862), p. 6, for the mediæval doggerel of the common people who rendered the maxim: *Consensus facit nuptias* by:

That a marriage, consummated outside the auspices of the church, was nevertheless valid, is explained by the fact that in both canon and civil law the condition of a marriage contract was the mutual consent of the principals. The civil law read: *Ubi non est consensus non est matrimonium*; those who conformed thereto could not be denied the privileges of the church.¹ Still, the early church attitude toward marriage, that of a sacrament,² and the constant watchfulness of the civil authorities to protect the sanctity of the marital pledge tended to place the functions, both of betrothal and of marriage solemnization, in the hands of the priests.³ So that, although the civil law criterion of valid union was the simple consent of the principals,⁴ the growth of the spiritual power was such that, eventually, the marriage of a woman to a man came to mean a religious rite, without the sanctification of which by the church, validity was impaired.⁵ This view is further confirmed by the fact that the formulae of nuptial blessing pronounced by the priest have been changed, in their wording, to read as an exclusive and indispensable benediction.⁶

Boire, manger, coucher ensemble
Est mariage, ce me semble.

The nobles also shared this same idea of license; cf. *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 224-27:

Il ne pensent pas à lor ames;
Si n'i ont cloches ne moustiers,
Qui'l n'en est mie granz mestiers,
Ne chapelains fors les oiseaux.

¹ From earliest times it was allowed that a man could be married outside the church and without its benediction and yet not suffer excommunication therefor. Cf. BEAUCHET, *op. cit.*, pp. 1, 2, in his references to the Councils of Toledo (400 A. D.), Mayence (815 A. D.), and of Tibur (895 A. D.). The decision upon this matter in the first provincial council of Toledo is given thus: "Caeterum qui non habet uxorem et pro uxore concubinum habet, a communione non repollatur, tamen ut unius mulieris aut uxoris aut concubinae sit conjugatione contentus."

² Cf. TERTULLIANUS, *contra Marcion*, lib. v, cap. 18; *ibid.*, *ad uxorem*, lib. iv, cap. viii.

³ Cf. AMBROSIUS, *de Abraham*, lib. iv, cap. 7.

⁴ Cf. B. BRISSON, *De jure connubiorum*, in Vol. VIII, col. 1098 D, of the *Thesaurus antiquitatum Romanarum* (Utrecht, 1698).

⁵ Cf. J.-A. BRUTAILS, *Étude sur la condition des populations rurales de Roussillon au moyen-âge* (Paris, 1891), p. 117: "Le mariage était, avant tout, aux yeux de nos pères un sacrement: c'est assez dire quel rôle le droit canonique a joué en ces matières."

⁶ The priest, originally, uttered these words before the man and woman at the altar: "Matrimonium per vos contractum, ego tanquam minister Dei, confirmo, ratifico et benedico in nomine Patris," etc.; this formula does not date prior to the thirteenth century. The formula of the present time has these words: "Vos in matrimonium conjungo," etc., which arose from a confusion of the civil contract and the sacrament. Cf. T.-M.-J. GOUSSET *Théologie dogmatique*, Vol. II, cap. 2, cited in BEAUCHET, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

The requirement of a church ceremony for marriage did not exist in civil law during the period of the *Romans d'Aventure*, nor was there any such obligation until the *Ordonnances de Blois* (under Henri III, 1579) which prescribed a public service.

The ceremonials of marriage as described in the *Romans d'Aventure* are the historical outgrowth of three distinct traditions, namely, the Latin, the Teutonic, and the Romanist Christian. At the time of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Latin¹ and Teutonic elements had produced the completed French ceremonies of the *sponsalia* or preliminary contract of marriage, while to the Christian belonged the functions of the *matrimonium* or the sacrament of marriage. The *sponsalia* were the secular and the *matrimonium* the spiritual phases of mediæval marriage; the former had to do more strictly with the civil, the latter with the church authorities. In the *Romans d'Aventure* each function has its own observances and separate character. From the foregoing it can be seen how, by degrees, the increased prestige of the church² brought about the absorption of parts of the *sponsalia* ceremony into the sphere of the *matrimonium* formalities with the purpose of imbuing the whole marriage celebration with a religious spirit and of ridding that ceremony of any taint of barter which profane tradition had always attached to nuptials both in Latin and Teutonic history.³ Indeed, the influence of the church has prevailed to such an extent in the ceremonies of marriage that *sponsalia* and *matrimonium* have been changed about in importance as compared with their position at the period of the Frankish immigrations.⁴ Approximately, the midpoint of this long transition marks the era of the *Romans d'Aventure*.

¹ Cf. A. DANTIER, *Les femmes dans la société chrétienne* (Paris, 1879, 2 vols.), Vol. I, p. 309.

² Cf. LAVISSE ET RAMBAUD, *Histoire générale* (Paris, 1893), Vol. II, pp. 233-65.

³ Cf. A. BOUCHE-LECLERCQ, *Manuel des institutions romaines* (Paris, 1886), p. 377. Cf. also *infra*, p. 21, n. 2; at Rome the idea of purchase in marriage expressed itself only in symbol. The *dos* (called *dotarium* in the barbarian laws) designated the liberality of the husband to the wife, and was indispensable to legitimate marriage, distinguishing that from the concubinate by the fact that the *dos* was given. So the church (*Concil. Arelat.*, 524 A.D., § I, 4), adopted the same form of *sponsalia*: "Nullum sine dote fiat conjugium; juxta possibiliterat flat dos, nec sine publicis nuptiis quisquam nubere vel uxorem ducere praesumat."

⁴ Cf. ROBERTSON's statement in his *Essays* (London, 1878), p. 173: "We now give the name betrothal to the wedding of our forefathers, having transferred the older name and greater importance of the *desponsatio et dotatio* to the *traditio et sacrificatio* or the giving away. The wedding was the civil contract, deriving its name from the *weds*, pledges

TUTELAGE.

The status of a noblewoman in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as regards her marriage, was of a political rather than a domestic character. In the feudal *régime*, after the period when the fief had become hereditary, the difficulty arose of maintaining a domain secure, in case the successor to the fief was a minor or an unmarried woman. The patrimonial fief system vested a power in a father over his daughter, similar in nature to the control of the *paterfamilias* in the Roman family. And, here, it should be noted that the later feudal period shows a return to Roman ideas of guardianship as against the Germanic family system represented by early feudalism. Both the paternal power over a woman and the recognition of a sister's right to succeed, equally with a brother, to her parent's estate, are traceable to Roman influence. A daughter who married into a family outside the dominion of a *seigneur*, under whom she had hitherto been subject, was compelled to renounce her patrimony, in view of her marriage.

To renounce, therefore, implies that a woman was possessed of the right of succession¹ and with the recognition of that right came other privileges which meant the amelioration of woman's position before the law. Such changes were brought about very slowly, so that even at the twelfth century the marriage of noble women was a purely political affair conducted under the auspices of the suzerain concerned, who granted a woman's body, in the same breath in which he bestowed the rights and duties of the fief which went with her, upon the man he had selected.² In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries there is the testimony of the *Romans d'Aventure* presenting plainly, as they do, the conditions of later feudal times, especially with reference to women of noble rank. These romances do not make a woman so wholly abject before her superiors as is the case with the *Chansons de*

or securities, that passed between the bridegroom and the parents, or the guardians, of the bride. The giving away represented the final completion of the marriage after the necessary arrangements had been concluded, and upon this conclusion . . . a priest was to be present in order to sanctify the legal union with the blessing of the Church."

¹ Cf. E. LABOULAYE, *Recherches sur la condition civile et politique des femmes depuis les Romains jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, 1848), pp. 210-15.

² P. PARIS, *Romans de la Table Ronde* (Paris, 1877), Vol. V, p. 150.

Geste; on the contrary, the *Romans d'Aventure* represent noble-women objecting forcibly to marriages thrust upon them and distasteful to them on account of the motive by which a suzerain was prompted to consummate these unions for his own material ends.¹ Such remonstrances, from their cogency and frequent occurrence, prove that the *Romans d'Aventure* portray a new period in which woman is no longer a mere subject of barter, as she once had been, but that she has emerged from the lowly condition where she was looked upon as a chattel in marriage transactions and has acquired a fair amount of independence.²

Abstractly considered, a woman of noble birth had had from early times an inherent right to accept or reject, at will, any proposition of marriage made to her or her guardians,³ but this right was not held sacred, it may with truth be said, at any part of the feudal period. As far back as the sixth century Chlotaire I declared null the authorizations obtained to marry women against their will.⁴ Numerous documents are extant which show that a father did not believe he had the power to marry his daughter, contrary to her own wishes, nor without consulting his lord and his own friends.⁵ Not seldom, the *Romans d'Aventure* present cases of a woman being allowed to accept or refuse an intended husband, even when the offer has been made by one whose word, if need be, could readily force her to a decision.⁶

A WOMAN IN THE TUTELAGE OF HER FATHER.

Under this rubric are to be found examples in the *Romans d'Aventure* which exhibit the nature of parental control in the

¹ Cf. R. ROSIÈRES, *Histoire de la société française au moyen-âge* (Paris, 1882), Vol. I p. 33.

² Cf. *Comte de Poitiers*, vv. 9687-700; *Fergus*, vv. 215-22; *Escanor*, vv. 9310-19; *La Chaste-laine de St. Gille*, vv. 218-25; the young woman's protest to her suitor:

La rage vous tint, ce me semble,
Quant vous à mon pere donastes
L'avoir de q(u)oï vous m'achatastes,
Ausi comme je fuisse une beste.

³ Cf. *Rouil de Cambrai*, vv. 6184-91, and L. GAUTIER, *La Chevalerie* (Paris, 1884), p. 345.

⁴ T. M. LERTEROU, *Histoire des Institutions mérovingiennes et carolingiennes*, 2 vols (Paris, 1843-44), Vol. I, pp. 150, 151.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 151, 152.

⁶ Cf. *Comtesse de Ponthieu*, vv. 84-93; *Floris et Liriope*, vv. 290-304; *Paris et Vienne*, p. 38; *Li Livre de Baudoin*, p. 81.

Middle Ages.¹ A father's word could create or unmake a betrothal arbitrarily.² By virtue of the *mundium*³ which he held over his children he was, at one and the same time, their father and lord as well.⁴ On the other hand, the part played by a mother was insignificant in comparison; whether she concurred in her daughter's suit, or manifested disfavor of it, availed but little.⁵ Exceptionally, however, occasions present themselves in the poems now in question, where a mother's influence is brought to bear indirectly upon the subject of a suitor for her daughter, and with effect.

The wishes of a woman about to be married, and for whom a marriage is being arranged, are seldom respected or consulted.⁶ In order to elude her father, therefore, she connives with her lover, who has been thrust aside by her unwilling parent for another, to defeat her lord's purposes by a resort to ruse.⁷ An indulgent father is, now and then, represented as not mindful whether his daughter marries or not, and seemingly leaves her⁸ to

¹ Cf. *L'Escoufle*, vv. 2005-09; *Joufrroi*, vv. 3487-98, 3501-06; *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 221-13, 2229-34; *Flore et Jehanne*, p. 96 (*Bibl. Elzévir*, 108, Paris, 1856); *L'Atre périlleux*, vv. 3784-88; *Galerent*, vv. 7655-63, 7669-72; *Comtesse de Ponthieu*, pp. 45, 46, A. DELVAU [ed.] (Paris, 1865); *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 5602-17; *La Manékine*, vv. 511-18, 522-24; *Escaror*, vv. 94-106; *Ipomédon*, vv. 87-95, 10449-60, 10520, 10521.

² Cf. *Flore et Jehanne*, p. 95, where, speaking of a father's power, it says: "il puet faire de sa fille sa volonte."

³ Cf. DU CANGE, *Gloss. med. et inf. Lat.*, Vol. IV, p. 576, *sub voce*, and J. MICHELET, *Ori-gines du droit français* (Paris, 1837), pp. 28, 29.

⁴ Cf. E. LABOULAYE, *op. cit.*, p. 15; cf. also, *L'Escoufle*, vv. 2163-75; and SEYNT GRAAL, ed. F. J. Furnivall (London, 1863): "Le [Lamet] vous [Piers] requier dont," fait li rois lamer, "ke vous prenes ma fille a feme par ensi que je vous saisirai de toute ma terre." . . . "Sires" fait pierres "vous fesistes ma requeste de ce que ie plus desiroie, et pour chou que vous le fesistes, ferais iou chou ke vous requeres." Et li rois l'en merchie mult. Et fu la puchiele tout maintenant mandee si le flancha pierres et le prist a feme. Et le iour ke les nuches furent i vint li rois lues. En la chite d'orchanie furent les nuches grans et plenieres s'i demoura li rois .viiij. iours.

⁵ Cf. *L'Escoufle*, vv. 2809-2904; note the expression of the mother to her husband the emperor:

"Je sui femme qui n'en puis mais,
Si le m'estuet souffrir em pais,"

Ibid., vv. 2897, 2898; cf. also *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 4343 ff.

⁶ Cf. *L'Atre périlleux*, vv. 3784-88; *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 2229-34; *Chevalier as deus espées*, vv. 4509-31.

⁷ Cf. *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 3058-75, where an eloping pair make good their escape by means of disguise in bearskins. Also in *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 5600-604, two young women concert a plan of evasion from home in order to meet their lovers who are some distance away.

⁸ Cf. *Escaror*, vv. 94-106. For an example also of this same nature in epic poetry the passage in *Raoul de Cambrai*, vv. 5794-801, will serve well; vide T. WRIGHT, *Womankind in Western Europe* (London, 1869), pp. 111, 112, for remarks on this passage. Also, cf. P. VIOLETT, *Histoire du droit civil français* (Paris, 1880), p. 411, note; and *supra*, p. 5, n. 6.

herself on the subject. Such cases are rare in the *Romans d'Aventure*.

The arbitrary character of a father's will concerning his marriageable daughter is shown nowhere in the poems now under discussion to be so truculent as in the example of a king of Hungary who falls in love with his own daughter and makes as if to marry her by force.¹ The young woman, learning that her father's council of barons acquiesces and that permission for her marriage is about to arrive from the Pope, secures a heavy knife out of the royal kitchen, and, with it, severs her left hand. The provenience of this poem being oriental² it will not serve as an example of fact, although the accessory circumstances of the story give to the narrative an air of verisimilitude even on French soil.³

A WOMAN IN THE TUTELAGE OF HER BROTHER.

Feudal life required that, once the head of the family was dead, the eldest son assume the function of parental control. A noblewoman, therefore, who had lost her father, was at her brother's disposal in marriage, since to him had been transferred the *mundium*. By means of this right over her he could place her in the hands of whom he might see fit.⁴ Naturally, this brother desired to marry her to one who would preserve well the fief which, with her hand in marriage, passed as *dot* over to him. One example in particular shows how several nobles, in adjacent domains, having expressed outwardly a desire to marry a certain noblewoman, grew angry with her brother because he had not acceded to the request of any one of them. Instead, her hand was proffered to a nobleman who, in the absence of the lord of the woman in question, had defended his estates from marauders and who, ultimately, received her in marriage, rather as a reward for material favors rendered. The ingratiating manner with which this guardian brother is represented in the poem to approach

¹ Cf. *La Manéchine*, vv. 722-36.

² Cf. G. PARIS, *Littérature française au moyen-age* (Paris, 1890), pp. 84 and 211; also vide H. SUCHIER, *S.A.T.F.* (1884), Vol. XIX, p. lxxv. Cf. also E. DU MÉRIL, *Floire et Blancefor*, Introd., pp. cxli ff. (Paris, 1856), where the influence of decadent Greek literature upon early French poetry is treated.

³ Cf. R. ROSIÈRES, *op. cit.*, pp. 368-70.

⁴ Cf. *Ille et Galeron*, vv. 1430-74.

his sister about the marriage, and the seeming deference paid her, are no doubt explainable from her brother's motives.¹

As indicative of this same material element surrounding marriage considerations a romance² dated at least twenty years later than the time of *Ille et Galeron*³ just referred to, reveals a situation in which the woman to be married is disposed of by her brother to a knight who was to become a liegeman of the king according to the marriage contract, and also to receive thereby, in return for services which the knight had rendered her brother, the woman's hand in marriage.

Following along the course of time in which the *Romans d'Aventure* occur, another romance,⁴ illustrative of the point made above, may be noted whose date falls a score of years after the poem just cited. In this poem is presented a brother ready to offer his sister, together with a parcel of land, to a knight who has befriended him, and whom this brother desires to recompense for his timely deliverance from peril. Although the young woman's hand and her brother's lands are offered together in one to the knight, he, by exception, refuses in a courteous manner the property, but accepts the woman as an all-sufficient reward for his favors to her brother. Other examples are not wanting to demonstrate how, in a brother's hand, a marriageable sister went to serve his material ends.⁵ One case in point may be drawn from the last, in chronological order, of the *Romans d'Aventure*⁶ which evidences no change of attitude toward woman as compared with the example used above and occurring seven generations previously.⁷ The episode, from this the latest of the extant romances, recounts how a brother secures the privilege to marry a certain noblewoman of his choice, by yielding his own

¹ Cf. *ibid.*, vv. 952, 953 where it is to be noticed that Galeron has already refused the attentions of Rogelion, a nephew of a Breton lord. Cf. also *supra*, p. 5, n. 2.

² Cf. *Ipomedon*, between the dates A. D. 1174 and 1190; possibly 1185.

³ Ca. 1167 A. D.

⁴ *Guillaume de Palerne*, in the *S.A.T.F.*, Vol. XVIII, 1876; for the date of this poem vide p. xxii of this work.

⁵ *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 3079-89; this instance, however, portrays a subject acceding to a king's request simply. Also vide *Cléomadès*, vv. 17616-22, and *Ecanor*, vv. 6661-70, and *Claris et Laris*, vv. 7975-83.

⁶ Cf. *Sone de Nausay*, *Bibl. Litt. Ver. in Stuttgart*, Vol. CCXVI, p. 8.

⁷ Cf. *supra*, p. 7, n. 3.

sister to the brother of the man from whom he has, in this way, obtained permission to marry the latter's sister. Heeding not at all his sister's feelings in the matter of her choice of a husband, the young man seals agreement to her marriage and, by sacrificing her interests, gains his own. The seven specimens of fraternal guardianship above referred to evince clearly what was the character of motive throughout appertaining to woman's welfare. Five out of the seven examples just given make her marriage a *quid pro quo* in the furtherance of her brother's purposes.

A WOMAN IN THE TUTELAGE OF FEUDAL SUPERIORS.

This subdivision of feudal guardianship concerns itself with the disposal of a woman in marriage when a lord or the advisory body of a ruler must execute this prerogative.¹ The contingencies incident to feudal life often brought a female vassal before her suzerain to be disposed of in marriage. As soon as feudal domains had been converted from concessions into patrimonies it devolved upon a suzerain to watch closely any possession within his confines where an heiress or a male minor held a fief. A woman, inheriting a fief, could not marry without the consent of her lord, who, moreover, might force her to marriage at her coming of age. If the lord paid no regard to this matter, when the heiress reached twelve years she was allowed to demand of him three noblemen to appear at his court, one of whom she had the right to choose.² In the *Romans d'Aventure*, while no direct instance of this privilege of an heiress is given, there are cases which illustrate sufficiently the relation of suzerain to vassal.³ The example occurs of an emperor⁴ who, desirous of requiting a nobleman for his valuable services as a *connétable*, gives him in return the hand of a noblewoman of Genoa. A messenger of the emperor appears before this noblewoman with a summons to appear at court, directly, for her marriage, upon which she has not been consulted at all previously. Then the emperor appoints

¹Cf. *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 6465-73; *L'Escoufe*, vv. 2255-90; *Messire Gauvain*, vv. 4325-36 and 5888-79.

²Cf. E. LABOULAYE, *op. cit.*, pp. 257, 258.

³Cf. *Méraugis de Portlesquez*, vv. 3833-39, and, as an interesting specimen from epic poetry, *vide Raoul de Cambrai*, vv. 5823-25, and vv. 6832-37.

⁴Cf *L'Escoufe*, vv. 1673-89.

the day for the wedding and orders his counts and princes to attend. Examples similar to this recur throughout the *Romans d'Aventure* and need not be detailed.¹ One romance² shows how a king is besought by a royal parent to restore to him his daughter, who has run away to seek for her lover. The king addressed answers the father that the young woman in question is not within his power to restore, but had been placed under the control of the knight about to marry her.³

The subject of a king's or a nobleman's marriage found frequently a place in the consultations of a court council. Apparently the decision of such a body carried with it great weight as to the choice or rejection of a woman; for upon it depended the welfare of an entire country, or of whole fiefs within a country. It occurs in the *Romans d'Aventure* that a king, in addressing his council of barons with regard to the marriage he anticipates, speaks to them as his "lords and masters" who hold it in their power to confer or to keep back the favor he asks of them.⁴ To such a group of counsellors fell the duty of attending to any emergencies arising from accidental death of a king, as in the example of one poem which shows how a ruler was slain suddenly in a forest. The queen calls at once her barons together, proposing to them that they resume their lands from her. But the feudatories concur with the *sénéchal* of the late king, and aim to force her to marry again. The queen, however, in order to defeat their plan by remaining a widow, so the episode concludes, had to flee from her barons and keep out of their way.⁵

Already reference has been made to the circumscribed control exercised by a mother in marriage affairs.⁶ Occasionally she manifested a decided aversion to a suit proposed either by her husband for their daughter, or suggested by the daughter herself.⁷ Her opposition was futile. A rather extreme instance of the morose anger of a mother against her son is furnished by one

¹ Cf. *Escanor*, vv. 9280-310.

² Cf. *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 5510-18.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, v. 5512. The word used for control is *baillie*; for its significance in this connection cf. *Gaufrey*, vv. 7370-73.

⁴ Cf. *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 5125-30. *Vide also L'Escoufle*, vv. 2131 ff., where a king outplays his barons by securing their consent to a match before they are fully aware.

⁵ Cf. *Floriant et Florete*, 440-50.

⁶ Cf. *supra*, p. 6, n. 2.

⁷ Cf. *Ipomedon*, vv. 907-15, and *L'Atre périlleux*, vv. 3755-82; *Sone de Nausay*, vv. 7867-47.

poem,¹ which relates how, on the very day of his marriage, she forsook him and went to live in a distant town, because she could not be reconciled to countenancing her son's marriage with one whom she considered to be a woman who had strayed by chance to the shores of her son's kingdom.² An example of resented guardianship is that where a noblewoman, a widow, is forced by her son, who assumes his father's rights over her, to marry, whether or no, a man of his own choosing.³

Less often, as compared with the *Chansons de Geste*, do ruptures of open disagreement occur in the *Romans d'Aventure* between a seigneur and his vassal about the disposal of a daughter in marriage. The time is already far past to admit of scenes such as are found in the poems of the epic age.⁴ On the contrary, in the *Romans d'Aventure*, a king may be observed seeking permission to marry his subject's daughter or sister, or else it is the scene of a ruler unwilling to break his promise, made to a vassal, of a woman's hand in marriage.⁵ The manners of the epic age are stamped by truculence; the age of the romances, as has been hinted at above, did not wholly rid itself of brusqueness, though the severity of its manners was tempered greatly through the growing influence of the church and its adoration of the Mother of Christ. Woman's domestic and political status owed the amelioration it received in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries to this influence.⁶

BETROTHAL.

The relative importance in the Middle Ages of the function of the *sponsalia* and that of the *matrimonium* has been noticed in the introduction to this study.⁷ The narrations in the *Romans d'Aventure* dealing with engagements state, usually, that an agreement to marry occurs between a man and a woman, either directly in person, or, in case they are absent from each other,

¹ Cf. *La Manéchine*, vv. 2089-94.

² Cf. *ibid.*, vv. 2053-62.

³ Cf. *Cléomadès*, v. 17925, the expression: "Ou vousist ele ou non."

⁴ Cf. *Garin le Loherain*, vv. 2089-2130.

⁵ Cf. *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 3041-58.

⁶ For progress in ideas of refinement vide H. MICHELANT, *Guillaume de Palerne*, S.A.T.F. (1876), Vol. V, p. ii; E. DUMÉRIL, *Floire et Blanceflor* (Paris, 1856), p. clvi; and C. HIPPEAU, *Amadas et Ydoine* (Paris, 1863), pp. iv-vi.

⁷ Cf. *supra*, p. 3, n. 4.

the agreement to marry occurs by proxy.¹ The proposal of marriage is generally addressed by the man to the woman in exalted language.² If, as sometimes it happens, a woman takes occasion to propose marriage to the man, she is generally represented as either struggling against her impulses, or, if not that, is described as being refused outright, by the person addressed, for her abruptness.³

After the man has offered himself to the woman in marriage and has added, besides, promises of protection to her person and lands, or has given his word to increase her wealth,⁴ then the woman, as a rule, acquiesces and their engagement is consummated. At the conclusion of a proposal from a woman a knight naturally rejects her hand, or else, if unwilling to offend her, expresses his thanks for her words and manages to evade her afterwards.⁵ The scenes where a betrothal occurs vary with the narratives of each poet; it may be an orchard or a bedroom or the banquet hall of a castle where the lovers meet to plight their troth. The language of the woer is as courteous and winning as he can command.⁶ After swearing by *druerie*⁷ and offering himself with all that he has in return for the woman's love, the man extends to her his hand,⁸ or else gives her a kiss,⁹ and, at times, the lovers exchange rings.¹⁰

Of the romances which portray a woman making an offer of love to a man, the first, in order of time, is of the twelfth century,

¹ Cf. *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 2565 ff., and *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10399-440.

² For examples of elegance in diction *vide Claris et Laris*, vv. 7919-64, and *Richars li Biaus*, vv. 4975-5040.

³ Cf. *Fergus*, vv. 2583-619, where the regret of the knight is referred to a regret at having rebuffed the woman for her advances, because his conduct in so doing was contrary to his vow of chivalry.

⁴ Cf., e. g., *Guillaume d'Angletterre*, vv. 1101-10 and 1116-18.

⁵ Cf. the following romances for examples of a man proposing marriage to a woman: *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10169-74, *Escanor*, vv. 9084-75, and vv. 10249-50; *Méraugis de Portlesquez*, vv. 450-53; *L'Atre périlleux*, vv. 3755-64; *Chevaliers as deus espées*, vv. 2872, 2873; *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 319-28; *L'Escoufle*, vv. 4498-501. These romances show the woman proposing to the man: *Richars li Biaus*, vv. 1693-701; *Blancandin*, vv. 3452-62; *Fergus*, vv. 1927-38; *Sone de Naucaay*, vv. 697-708.

⁶ The form of the verb is always second person plural of address, either from the man or the woman. Cf. *L'Escoufle*, vv. 2360-69.

⁷ Cf. *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10169-74; *L'Atre périlleux*, vv. 3755-64.

⁸ Cf. *Joufrois de Poitiers*, vv. 2097-105.

⁹ Cf. *Galerent*, vv. 2258-60.

¹⁰ Cf. *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 319-28.

about the middle.¹ The poet shows her in an endeavor to make a proposal which, however, she foregoes owing to scruples of etiquette. From a poem of the thirteenth century, or more than one hundred years later than the example above referred to, a scene is given where the heroine calls upon God to help her declare her love to the hero. She does not make a proposal, in fact, but denounces the idea of such a thing finally.² In spite of these examples of modesty singled out from the beginning and middle of the *Romans d'Aventure* period, there are two separate instances of a woman proposing to a man, without hesitation, in the last poem of this class, which falls in the fourteenth century.³ There are, even in the thirteenth-century poems, instances of women proposing marriage to the man of their choice, although this cannot serve to prove what was the condition of etiquette in real life.⁴ For simplicity of manners in the Middle Ages a clear example is given in a poem near the beginning of the thirteenth century: a young woman yields to the confession of her heart to the hero of the story, whom she awakes, in the dead of night, from sleep, she being powerless to conceal longer the passion which was consuming her, and, turning from her own bedroom into his, reveals her love. This phase, however, is wide of the purpose here and has to do with manners rather than the ceremonial form of engagement.⁵

Mention is frequently made in the romances of a church celebrant formally solemnizing betrothals. The Pope is shown, by one poet, presiding at a betrothal.⁶ Archbishops,⁷ bishops,⁸ and chaplains⁹ also superintend this function. In a castle where

¹ Cf. *Ille et Galeron* in W. FOESTER'S *Romanische Bibliothek* (Halle, 1891), Vol. VII, p. 2.

² Cf. *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 3930-33:

Onques n'of dire en ma vie
Que dame priast chevalier;
Et se je faz cestui prier,
Bien m'en porra tenir por fole.

³ Cf. *Sone de Nausay*, vv. 15091-105 and 17342-58.

⁴ Cf. W. SÖDERJELM, in *Romania*, Vol. XV, pp. 581, 582 (1886).

⁵ Cf. *Fergua*, vv. 1927-38; *vide also Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 1122-68, where the poet lessens the harshness of effect by presenting a scene of proposal from a woman in the form of a dream.

⁶ Cf. *Ille et Galeron*, vv. 3367-89.

⁷ Cf. *Partonopeus de Blois*, v. 10460.

⁸ Cf. *Comte d'Artois*, p. 11, l. 16; *Galerent*, vv. 6458-61.

⁹ Cf. *La Manéchine*, v. 2031.

engagements usually took place, were to be found chaplains for this purpose and, if necessary, to attend to the celebration of marriage as well.¹ Betrothal ceremonies before a priest do not occur in a church,² but are mentioned in connection with a chapel.³ Only the important betrothals of people of station seemed to require the presence of a priest or chaplain connected with a castle. There was no law which demanded a priest to preside at betrothals. All that was necessary to validity of promise to marry was, from of old, that the bride should be present with her relatives at the ceremony of betrothal; further, the consent of both man and woman was obligatory and the contract, if broken, subjected either to a fine of compensation.⁴ For the reason that this agreement was a secular one, it needed not to be, therefore, consummated in a church.

Instances of betrothals conducted without the intervention of a priest but, in lieu of him, through the agency of one outside the church, give evidence of the time when a father's authority, or that of a king, sufficed in the stead of the priestly function, when as yet only the patriarchal function existed.⁵ These secular betrothals reveal great clearness in the form of wording employed by the poets⁶ and two narratives, in particular, appear to be modeled after ritual.⁷ The romances most often exhibit a father in charge of his daughter's betrothal, when no priest is

¹ Cf. E.-E. VIOLETT-LE-DUC, *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française* (Paris, 1869), Vol. III, p. 103.

² That is to say in a *moustier*, or *glise*.

³ Cf. *Raoul de Cambrai*, vv. 3683, 3684.

⁴ Cf. L. J. KOENIGSWARTER, *Histoire de l'organisation de la famille* (Paris, 1851), pp. 122, 123, where is cited the decree (*till. lxx*) of the Salic Laws. Cf., also, *Hugues Capet*, vv. 4186 ff.

⁵ Cf. E. WESTERMARCK, *The History of Human Marriage* (London, 1901), 3d ed., pp. 426, 427. Cf. also the *Autularia*, of PLAUTUS, II, 2 (Goetz et Schoell, Lips., 1898), pp. 126, 127.

⁶ Cf. the ceremony presided over by King Arthur's wife in *Cligès*, vv. 2340-47:

La reine andeus les anbrace
Et fet a l'un de l'autre don.
An riant dit: Je t'abandon,
Alixandre, le cors t'amie.
Bien sai qu'au cuer ne fauz tu mie.
Qui qu'an face chiere ne groing,
L'un de vos deus a l'autre doing.
Tien tu le tuen et tu la toe.

⁷ Cf. *Le Chevalier au Cygne*, vv. 128-32, and also *Gaydon*, vv. 10, 847-57, which, though a *Chanson de Geste*, is a rare example of the point in question. Cf. also *Raoul de Cambrai*, vv. 5833-38.

at hand.' In a Franco-Provençal story of the thirteenth century² is given a betrothal scene at early morning: the suitor repairs with the young woman's father to her chamber, and there he is presented to her; the bride is also presented to the young man and her consent to marriage is secured. The formal introduction of the man to the woman and the woman to the man, and the rest of the ceremony, conclude with the shaking of hands of the pair and a word of farewell from the woman to her departing lover.³

Illustrations from manuscripts depicting a betrothal scene show the presiding figure with the man on his right hand and the woman on his left.⁴ The young man's left hand is held in the right hand of the king who is superintending the ceremony, while the young woman's right hand, covered with a long mitt, is enclosed in the king's left hand. The head of the king turns, as if in speaking posture, toward the young man who, with raised right hand, seems to be pledging himself at the moment.⁵ Taken collectively, these secular betrothals present no wider variations in the *Romans d'Aventure* than have been noticed here above, nor do they differ in form from the ceremony in charge of a celebrant of the church.

BETROTHAL BEFORE A COURT OF BARONS.

The part exercised by a king's barons or court council in the matter of the betrothal of royal couples falls more properly, for treatment, under the subject of *tutelage* as it offers few important data for this division of the subject. However, there are several examples of sufficient value to include under a separate rubric.⁶ The function of the barons at a betrothal appears

¹Cf. *Cléomades*, vv. 17645-51, *Flamenca*, vv. 284-89; *Olivier de Castille*, p. 54; *Le Comte d'Artois*, p. 41; *Chevaliers as deus espées*, vv. 4544-55; *Joufrois de Poitiers*, vv. 3501-12.

²Cf. *Flamenca*, vv. 2844 ff.

³Cf. *ibid.*, v. 289, "Soan dis: 'A Dieu vos coman.'"

⁴Cf., for reproductions of the MS illustrations, *Le Comte d'Artois*, p. 41, and *Olivier de Castille*, p. 54.

⁵Cf. P. BERGMANS, *Li livre d'hystoire de Olivier de Castille et de Artus d'Algarve*, (Gand, 1897), pp. 7, 8: "Au point de vue des mœurs, sujets tels que la scène des flancailles et celle du mariage offrent un réel intérêt documentaire."

⁶Cf. *L'Escoufe*, vv. 2314-38; *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 8314-20; *Sone de Nausay*, p. 434.

to be ornamental, and their presence merely for sake of added dignity,¹ but in a romance of the beginning of the thirteenth century are set forth the details of transactions which occur between a ruler and his nobles whose permission to give his daughter in marriage was secured by means of a stratagem on his part.² In this story, the disposal of the woman's hand lay entirely with the council of the king, who himself could not proceed except upon their initiative. The ceremony of this betrothal is as follows: the emperor presides as celebrant and the pair are represented as standing before him in costly garments; the youth takes the hand of the girl, and the pledging follows before the holy relics and in presence of fifty barons.³ Either secular or church celebrants are represented as presiding over these functions at which barons are said to attend. Only in the case of royal *sponsalia* ceremonies are barons mentioned as present at the solemnization of betrothals.

BETROTHAL EFFECTED INDIRECTLY.

Betrothal by proxy occurred frequently during the Middle Ages, and was occasioned by the exigencies incident to the life of those times. There exist accounts of historical examples of this form of betrothal which serve as reference and as a basis of comparison for the fictitious descriptions found in the *Romans d'Aventure*.⁴ One of these latter merits analysis here on account of the clearness of its outline of the ceremony in question.⁵ At

¹ Cf. the stock expressions employed by the poets: "Voiant la cort et le barnage," and "Tout par devant la baronne," as simply descriptive.

² Cf. *L'Escoufle*, v. 2187, where there is question of a *don* to be made by the king's barons.

³ This couple was not of an age suitable for marriage, but to obviate this hindrance the emperor had, in their case, an earnest of real marriage celebrated, called *sponsalia per verba de futuro*. Cf. BEAUCHET, *op. cit.*, p. 39, and A. SCHULTZ, *Das höfische Leben zur Zeit der Minnesinger* (Leipzig, 1889), Vol. I, p. 630. For an example of betrothal solemnization before a king and barons cf. *Raoul de Cambrai*, vv. 5838-40:

Sor une table font les sains aporter,
Ilueques font les sairemens jurer,
Berniers del prendre et Guerris del donner.

The sacredness of this oath upon *sains* is shown clearly, though in another connection than betrothal, in *Durmar li Galois*, vv. 11205-17.

⁴ Cf. A. SCHULTZ, *op. cit.*, pp. 618-21, for various examples of betrothal by proxy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

⁵ Cf. *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 2563-86.

an Easter festival, thirty white-haired barons appear, representing the emperor of Greece, coming to seek, in his name, the hand of Melior, the Roman emperor's daughter, for Partenidon, the Greek emperor's son. The embassy is clad in fine raiment and adorned with gold and jewels. After an exchange of salutations between the emperor and the ambassadors, a spokesman slips forward and points out to him the mission of the Greeks. The woman, Melior, is asked in marriage in return for an ample supply of material wealth¹ to be given the daughter in case her father consents, which he is cautioned by the embassy to do.² The emperor next takes counsel with his barons concerning the offer and the agreement of marriage follows.³ Both sides—the emperor and ambassadors—pledge to have the fulfilment of their promise take effect on St. John's day.⁴ Throughout the city are heard shouts and tumults of rejoicing because the emperor's daughter has been betrothed.⁵ However, the real lover of Melior receives the same news with bewildered chagrin, and takes to his bed on account of the fact that his sweetheart had been affianced to another man.⁶ The Greek embassy remained at court with the Roman emperor, and then departed after three days.

The simple delivery of a message of love and, with it, a ring sent to a young woman by a knight as a token of his wish to marry her is instanced in a poem of the seventh decade of the thirteenth century.⁷ This shows a servant ordered by his master to appear with a message of proposal and a ring before a woman whom the knight had never seen; she, upon hearing the words of the messenger, evinced great pleasure and gave him an answer to

¹ Cf. *ibid.*, vv. 2627-90.

² Cf. *ibid.*, vv. 2637, 2638: Garde n'i ait refusement,
Ci voi tes princes et ta gent.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, v. 2840: "Si tu cest plait otroieras."

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, v. 2646: the length of time between betrothal and marriage in this case was nearly two months. For the regulation as to length of time required to elapse between the pledge of betrothal and marriage vide A.-A. BEUGNOT, *Assises de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1843), Vol. II, p. 112, and E. MARTÈNE, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus* (Antwerp, 1763-64), Vol. IV, p. 42. Cf. also *Flore et Jehanne*, pp. 96, 97.

⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, v. 2652: "Que dounee ert lor damoisele."

⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, v. 2660: "Que aflee estoit sa drue."

J. Cl. Floriant et Florete. xx. 4205-60.

take back, favorable to the knight's suit.¹ Contrary to this attitude of a woman accepting a lover whose suit was urged indirectly, there is an example of a woman upbraiding a king through his messenger for the reason that the suitor did not appear in person and was therefore committing a serious breach of etiquette. This being the only case of protest on this ground in the *Romans d'Aventure*, there is nothing to affirm concerning the standard of politeness in such a matter. However, in vindication of the woman's position, it is to be noticed that the sequel to the episode portrays the king departing to her castle in order to comply with her wishes.²

WEDDING.

The *Romans d'Aventure* refer to the wedding ceremony always as *espousailles*.³ This function is represented, in the poems in question, as occurring usually in a church, and always superintended by celebrants whose authority was that of the sacred priesthood of the Roman Church.⁴ Sometimes a wedding ceremony is described as taking place in a castle. Of the

¹ Cf. *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 4251-60:

Car mesire Gauvains m'envoie
A vous et dist que soiez sole,
Quar il est vostre chevaliers
De cuer et de cors tous entiers,
Si vous envoie .i. anelet,
Ou tout a vo vouloir se met.
Blanchandise en riant respont:
" Par Dieu, l'autime roi del mont,
Je ne le quier ja refusser
Bel m'est quant il me daigne amer."

² Cf. *Roi Flore et la belle Jehanne*, pp. 152, 153. For other examples of the kind treated in this subdivision above cf. *Cligès*, vv. 2859-70, and *Comte d'Artois*, pp. 69 and 84.

³ According to the meaning of the Latin etymon of this word *espousailles*, it should connote only betrothal. But, as a representative of the Latin *sponsalia*, the word *fiançailles* is used in French, from *fidantia* (*vide KÖRTING, Etym. Wörterbuch*, s. v.). And the French language, of the Romance idioms alone, has made this change, which affects also the forms *époux* and *épouse*. These latter, in French, have the meaning of *man* and *wife*, whereas in other Romance languages they indicate only persons betrothed. Occasionally a variant form occurs, like *espousement*; cf. *Guillaume de Dole*, v. 5367, and *Auberé*, v. 50; cf. EBELING's comment on *espousement* in his edition of this fableau, p. 45 (Halle, 1895). Cf. also *Guillaume de Palerne*, v. 8520, and *Roi Flore et la belle Jehanne*, pp. 93 and 96, where the words *mariage* and *mariée* occur respectively in the sense of "betrothal" and "betrothed." Likewise in *Fergus*, v. 6902, *mariage* occurs in the same sense.

⁴ Just as in the case of betrothals already cited (p. 4, n. 1, and p. 13, n. 9), the celebrants at weddings described in the *Romans d'Aventure* represent high and low position in order of ecclesiastical rank; cf. *Ille et Galeron*, v. 6551, where the Pope presides at a ceremony, and in *Comte de Poitiers*, v. 978, an abbot. Cf. also *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 3450-55.

twenty-four examples of wedding description here chosen from the *Romans d'Aventure* fourteen ceremonies are performed in a church, away from a castle.¹ Seven marriage scenes are represented as happening in castles² and three are not designated as to where the ceremony is performed.³

The expressions, used by the poets, in stating how a marriage was celebrated vary somewhat: four cases declare the man to have married the woman directly,⁴ while nine instances show that the celebrants married the bride to the groom, or married them to each other mutually.⁵ Two examples narrate the marriage ceremony as being conducted by the priest, who questions the parties in turn. In each case the groom is the one first addressed, and, afterward, the bride.⁶ The remainder of the examples do not state clearly enough the details of the wedding ceremony to admit of a fixed classification.⁷

As a rule the poets confine the wedding ceremony in their works to the marriage of one pair, although, occasionally, as many as three couples are joined at one nuptial celebration and, as sometimes happens, two pairs are united.⁸ In whatever manner a poet depicts a nuptial service he shows plainly that the woman is the subsidiary party to the sacred contract before the priest. Two features of two separate romances may have their place here:

¹ Cf. *Éracles*, vv. 2812, 2813; *Ille et Galeron*, vv. 6547-51; *Ipomédon*, vv. 87-95; *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 8899-8909; *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10711, 10712; *Galerent*, vv. 7699-7701; *Fergus*, vv. 6937-40; *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 5348, 5349; *L'Escoufle*, vv. 8288, 8289; *Flamenca*, v. 292; *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 14776, 14777; *Claris et Laris*, vv. 29568, 29569; *Escanor*, vv. 23022, 23023; *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 6071-73.

² *Ille et Galeron*, vv. 1516-29; *Comte de Poitiers*, vv. 971-81; *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, vv. 1305-10; *Roman de la Violete*, vv. 6513-32; *La Manékine*, vv. 2029-40; *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 4738-55; *Sone de Nausay*, vv. 17019-40.

³ *Richars li Biaus*, vv. 4105-25; *Comtesse de Ponthieu*, pp. 2, 3; *Olivier de Castille*, p. 17.

⁴ *Éracles*, vv. 2812, 2813; *Fergus*, vv. 6918, 6919; *Roman de la Violete*, vv. 6573, 6574; *Sone de Nausay*, vv. 17031, 17032.

⁵ *Ille et Galeron*, vv. 1525, 6551; *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, vv. 1306, 1307; *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 8904, 8905; *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10738-35; *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 14988, 14989; *Claris et Laris*, vv. 29568, 29569; *Escanor*, vv. 23027, 23028; *La Manékine*, vv. 2037, 2038.

⁶ Cf. *Comte de Poitiers*, vv. 978-81; *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 4740-45.

⁷ Cf. *Galerent*, vv. 7699-724; *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 5307-71; *L'Escoufle*, vv. 8283-89; *Flamenca*, vv. 290-92; *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 6071-6102; *Richars li Biaus*, vv. 4120-25; *Comtesse de Ponthieu*, pp. 2, 3; *Comte d'Artois*, p. 22; *Olivier de Castille*, p. 17.

⁸ Cf. *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 8899-8909; *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10711-35; and *Escanor*, vv. 23021-33; *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 6071-108.

the bathing of the bride-elect two whole days before her marriage, as set forth in an early romance, and the reference in another poem to the formality of a kiss at the close of the wedding service.¹

In order to add a more constructive phase to the analysis now in hand, it will be necessary to point out the connected details of one entire wedding service, such as are given, for instance, in the romance of *Sone de Nausay*.² The immediate context in this lengthy poem does not show at what time the marriage of Sone with Odee takes place. The ceremony occurs in the castle at Galoche, and all but the great nobles and ladies (*la grant baronne*) are excluded. The clerks do the chanting of the service; an archbishop, three bishops, and an abbot celebrate the mass. Sone removes his mantle of scarlet and ermine,³ and robes himself in a white cloak (*une blanque*). The pair are led up to the altar⁴ and all present bend backward (*souvins*). After this a care cloth of *samit* is spread over Sone and Odee.⁵ White cloth-pieces (*touailles*) are then cast over the bridal pair,⁶ and in this white apparel they hear the archbishop intone the nuptial mass. At the close of this part of the service the pair, standing up, receive the sacrament. At the order of the priest, the bride and groom retire from the altar and are then anointed. All present wear white. Finally, an abbot chants a mass and the offering is made, participated in first by the king, and later by the others.

Unfortunately none of the poets of the *Romans d'Aventure* carries the element of realism, for which this general class of literature has been distinctive in every age, so far as to give, word for word, each phase of the wedding solemnization in the church.⁷

¹ Cf. *Éracles*, v. 256, and *Flamenco*, v. 297; this last reference possibly has to do with the *pax* or osculatory as found in MARTÈNE, *op. cit.*, p. 616. By way of comparison cf. the mediæval German poem *Heimbrech*, vv. 1503-34, and K. WACKERNAGEL, *Verlobnis und Trauung* in HAUPP'S *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum* (Leipzig, 1842), Vol. II, p. 548 ff.

² Cf. this poem, vv. 1017-54. The night before the wedding day Sone spends in fasting and prayer; cf. *infra*, p. 33, n. 4.

³ Cf. vv. 16746, 16747.

⁴ Cf. VIOLET-LE-DUC, *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'Archéologie*, Vol. II, p. 18 (Paris, 1868-74).

⁵ Cf. A. SCHULTZ, *Das höfische Leben*, Vol. I, p. 344.

⁶ Cf. the *Roman de Rou et des Ducs de Normandie*, (ed.) F. PLUQUET (Rouen, 1827) Vol. I, p. 276.

⁷ The descriptive tendency has been characteristic of all romantic literature of which the *Romans d'Aventure* represent the middle stage, placed as they are between the post-classic sea-romances like *Theagenes* and *Chariclea* of HELIODORUS (written, according to Jebb, 390 A.D.), and the modern *Paul et Virginie* of J.-H. BERNARDIN DE SAINT-PIERRE (written 1787).

However, the nucleus of the church ritual is exhibited in three romances¹ where the priest proposes the bride to the groom for acceptance and *vice versa*.² Usually at the same time as the question of assent to marry is being asked by the priest, he takes the right hand of the groom and that of the bride in such a manner that the pair hold each other's right hand, and the celebrant then places his own hands over those he has brought together into a clasped position.³ Then is pronounced the nuptial blessing. With this the bride and groom pass out of the church. The groom is represented as walking on the right side of the bride from the church, in order to have his right arm free for defense, in keeping with ancient custom.⁴ A far better clue to a ritual than is given in any one of the *Romans d'Aventure* and a form of service which exhibits the two cardinal conditions requisite for an honorable marriage, namely: *affinity* and *consent*, is to be found in a prose romance here cited below.⁵ Still, as has been already pointed out, enough details of the wedding ceremony are to be gathered from the *Romans d'Aventure*

¹ Cf. *Comte de Poitiers*, vv. 971-81; *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 5370, 5371; *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 4738-42.

² For the origin of this ritual cf. BRUNS, *fontes*, p. 86 (ed. MOMMSEN ET GRADENWITZ, Lips., 1893, 5th ed.): "Coemptio vero certis sollemitatibus peragebatur et sese in coemendo unicem interrogabant, vir, ita, an sibi mulier materfamilias esse vellet? Illa respondebat velle. Item mulier interrogabat; an vir sibi paterfamilias esse vellet? Ille respondebat velle." This formula, cited from BOETHIUS, *Schol. Virgiliana ad Aen.*, 4, 214, is the first part of the ceremony, the second part of which had to do with an appearance of purchase ("coemptio") of the bride by the groom, who struck a pair of scales with a coin, "matrimonium per aes et libram." This fictitious sale of Roman usage is the counterpart of the German custom of "matrimonium per solidum et denarium" described by TACITUS, *Germania*, 18 (ed. H. FUENEAUX, Oxford, 1894), but confounded by him with the Roman.

³ Cf. *Comte de Poitiers*, vv. 978, 979; *La Manekine*, vv. 2036, 2037.

⁴ Cf. *Comte d'Artois*, p. 22; also L. GAUTIER, *La Chevalerie*, p. 368.

⁵ Cf. R. DE MAULDE DE LA CLAVIÈRE, *Les femmes de la Renaissance* (Paris, 1898), note to p. 34: The priest, in a romance by G. CAVICEO (written in 1508) addresses a man and woman before him as follows:

Périgrin et vous Génève, estes vous francs et libérés de toute religion secrète ou manifeste?

Périgrin et Génève: Nous sommes libérés sans en rien estre obligez.

Ministre: Estes-vous point en affinité conjointez?

Périgrin et Génève: Nulle fut l'affinité et petite l'amitié.

Ministre: Avez-vous point promis à autre homme ne femme par mariage ne espoussailles?

Périgrin et Génève: Non, jamais.

Ministre: De vostre commun consentement estes-vous disposez à célébrer le présent saint sacrement de mariage?

Périgrin et Génève: De cuer et de foy faire le voulons.

Ministre: Toy, dame, le doy, et Périgrin, l'annel imposeras.

to form an approximate description of the entire church service. There are a number of expressions in the *Romans d'Aventure* which indicate their origin from church ritual by their form, and, according to the marriage formulæ of the church, handed down, are the identical, albeit fragmentary, wording of that ritual.¹

The bridal procession to the church is the occasion which the poet takes of extolling the beauties of the bride's form and dress; the groom, in these narrations, is almost lost from sight at this juncture.² The description of ceremonies in the front of the church is next attended to.³ Then follows the account of the singing and music as the wedding service commences.⁴ Hereupon, the remainder of the celebration at the church is divided into two parts: the marriage and the mass,⁵ between which a short interval supervenes for change of priests' vestments.⁶ Then, for the most part, at the close of the service, the mass is sung.⁷

It remains now to add wherein the poems under investigation do not show parallelism with the church formulæ of wedding consecration. In all the examples just considered, which represent a period of nearly two hundred years, there is no reference to any

¹ Cf., *Comte de Poitiers*, the words: "Sanctus," v. 972, and "Alezia," v. 974; *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, the expression in v. 1807: to receive a woman "de main d'un abé;" also *Éracles*, v. 5075: the expression "par main de prestre;" *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 8905-6: The patriarch Alexis "les assamble a mariage Par le costume et par l'usage Qu'il menoient en la contrée;" *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10729, 10730: "Li arcevesque sont avant Lor croces en lor mains tenant;" *Fergus*, v. 6839 (var.): "Luite est evangile et epistole;" *Guillaume de Dole*, vs. 5370, 5371: "En l'onor dou saint Esperit Et chanta de la Trinité;" *Escaror*, vv. 23021-26: here is a reference to the institution of banns; cf. *ibid.*: "par sairement et par paroles," v. 23033; *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 6083-86: "Li arcevesque et la clargie Ont tantost messe commence Que l'en dist du Saint-Esprete. Et quant l'Evangile fu dite;" *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 4741, 4742: the priest "puis demanda chasquin par soi S'il voellent estre à loy."

² Cf. *Éracles*, vv. 2570-76; *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10711-30; *Galerent*, vv. 7699-7703; *Dur mars li Galois*, vv. 14976-79.

³ Cf. *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 8894-99; *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 6074-77; *Amadas et Ydoine*, vv. 2343-94; *Clémadès*, vv. 17215-20. Cf. *MARTÈNE*, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 616, 617, where are given directions to the officiating priest before the nuptial blessing.

⁴ Cf. *Comte de Poitiers*, vv. 972, 973; *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 5370, 5371; *Fergus*, vv. 6021-23; cf. *DU CANGE*, *Gloss. med. et inf. Lat.*, Vol. I, p. 577, col. 2.

⁵ Usually the nuptial mass is made to occur after the wedding, as it should, but the romances of *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 6083-85, and *Sone de Nausay*, vv. 17028, 17029 reverse this order.

⁶ Cf. *Partonopeus de Blois*, v. 10728; *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 5290-93; *Sone de Nausay*, vv. 17027, 17028.

⁷ Cf. *La Manékine*, v. 2040; *Sone de Nausay*, v. 17029; sometimes the mass is designated as being said, only; cf. *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 8921, 8922.

ring ceremony. While the betrothal formalities required a ring for the woman to wear and the *Romans d'Aventure* are represented as usually providing her with this pledge of lovers,¹ still no mention is made of a ring in the various narrations of a marriage ceremony.² In the second place the romances take no account of any *wedding* ceremony at the church portal, where, according to the St. Gatien ritual here cited, the entire wedding service was conducted, up to the point where the priest placed the ring upon the bride's hand.³

Thirdly, the wedding garments of noble persons in the middle ages were white, but none of the romances, save one, gives any record of this fact.⁴

The groom is generally represented, in all of these poems, as having received knighthood before marriage, although to be a knight was not a condition of marriage. This is shown in the romance of *Sone de Nausay*, where one of the grooms, Henris, is not dubbed until after his marriage. The same is true of Jehan in *Jehan et Blonde*. In view of the fact that a youth could become knighted at fifteen years of age, it is plain that the age at marriage of both a bride and her groom was much earlier than in modern times. The romances state the age before a marriage as seventeen years for the groom and fifteen years for the bride, and in general, these numbers are a true record. Chrétien de Troyes represents Cligès as in the flower of his age at fifteen years. The church required the bride at marriage to be twelve years old, and the groom to be in his sixteenth year.⁵

THE RING IN BETROTHAL.

Just as the function of betrothal, in the Middle Ages, implied far more as an agreement, in the nature of a contract, not to be revoked without serious consequences, so also the betrothal ring,

¹ Cf. *Conte de la Violete*, vv. 6672-80.

² Cf. Dr. F. HOFMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 830, and p. 24, n. 2, *infra*.

³ Cf. MARTÈNE, *op. cit.*, p. 616; also the expression in the *Concil. Trevir.*, c. 5: "matrimonium cum honore et reverentia et in facie ecclesiae celebratum."

⁴ Cf. *Sone de Nausay*, vv. 17031, 17047, 17048; also, *Joufris de Poitiers*, vv. 1508 and 1522, where reference is made to the priest's vestments. Cf. also *Chevaliers as deus espées*, vv. 10323-28, where the queen's wedding dress is black samite worked in gold with figures of beasts and birds.

⁵ Cf. P. LABBÉ ET COSSART, *Collectio conciliorum* (Paris, 1671), Vol. X, p. 608.

or what was substituted for it sometimes, was held in greater esteem, relatively, than at a later period.¹ None of the *Romans d'Aventure* in the course of a wedding description refer to that part of the ceremony where the priest hands the ring to the groom in order that the latter may place it upon the bride's finger,² although there are passages in these poems which indicate clearly enough that the wedding ring had its proper part in the nuptial service.³ In the period of the *Romans d'Aventure* the betrothal ring bore with it the signification of the iron *anulus pronubus* of Roman usage during the Republic,⁴ from which the French betrothal ring has its origin, although the symbolic meaning which the church had succeeded in attaching to the betrothal ring had, by this time, divested it of its pagan significance; so much is this true, that the ring was ultimately confined to the marriage ceremony alone.

The descriptions of rings, as found in the *Romans d'Aventure*, represent them usually as jeweled with precious stones,⁵ the colors of which range from deep red, almost violet, to the light red of pale rubies.⁶ Diamonds in rings are not often mentioned.⁷ Gold is usually the material employed. Rings are sometimes represented as possessing magic powers.⁸

¹ For the symbols of betrothal other than the ring cf. *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 4393-4402.

² Cf. the brief but clear account of a ring ceremony in *Divi Crône*, by HEINRICH VON DEM TÜRLIN, vv. 13855-60 (ed. SCHOLL), *Bibl. Litt. Ver. in Stuttgart*, Vol. XXVII, p. 170, col. 2 (1852).

³ Cf. E. MARTÈNE, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*, Vol. II, p. 612 (Antwerp, 1763-64): "Benedictio super anulum—Creator et Conservator humani generis, Dator aeternae salutis, omnipotens Deus, tu permitte Spiritum sanctum Paraclitum super hunc anulum. Per." Cf. *infra*, p. 26, n. 6.

⁴ Cf. DR. F. HOFMANN, "Über den Verlobungs- und den Trauring," *Sitzungsberichte der K. Akad. der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Vol. LXV, pp. 827-64 (Wien, 1870). The ring, as is made clear in this monograph, was as common to ordinary business transactions in ancient times as it was to the *sponsalia* ceremonies, and was not peculiar to, nor original with, betrothals. On the contrary, the element of bargain or exchange, dominant in marriage transactions, both in the fictitious sale of the *Romans* and the customs of the Germanic peoples, required an earnest or token of pledge. This ring of iron, used at Rome (in the empire, however, a gold ring was used), was also adopted amongst the Germans. Cf. also *Archæologia* (London, 1814), Vol. XVII, pp. 124-27.

⁵ Cf. *Comte de Poitiers*, vv. 857, 858.

⁶ Cf. the expressions: "balais rubis" in *Guillaume de Dole*, v. 3342; "jagonce" (garnet, dark red) in *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, v. 3001, and "La pierre fu toute vermeille" in *Roman de la Viole*, v. 388. The color green is also mentioned; cf. *L'Escoufe*, v. 3812: "Ki plus ert vers que fuelle d'ierre."

⁷ Cf. *La Manéchine*, v. 6067; also *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 2585, where the jewels of the Greek embassy are said to shine like glass. Cf. also *Paris et Vienne*, p. 46.

⁸ Cf. *L'Escoufe*, vv. 4481 and 3813; also "La folie Tristan de Berne," *Romania*, Vol. XV, p. 573.

The *Romans d'Aventure* give several instances where, in lieu of a ring, a symbol for betrothal takes the form of a banner worked with gold, and is made for the woman, by her lover, in token of their troth.¹ Possibly this handiwork was given by the woman in exchange for a ring from her lover and not referred to by the poet. But it was common in the Middle Ages to use various symbols, in every-day life, on occasions that required the keeping of faith, even in trivial matters; so that a betrothal might have been consummated without any ring at all, though this is not very likely.² Another type of betrothals, in this connection of the ring, shows both man and woman making exchange of rings with each other.³ In still another class should be included those instances where the woman, alone, presents a ring to her lover as a symbol of her constancy.⁴

Two cases have been noted in which a man offers a betrothal ring to his *fiancée*.⁵ A singular example of a woman resorting to a trick is exhibited in one poem, where it is represented that a rejected suitor receives, supposedly from the lady who hitherto had not favored his suit, a ring and other emblems of good faith as a mark of her change of mind toward him and as a sign that she was willing now for him to accept her.⁶

It is clear from the *Romans d'Aventure* that the betrothal rings were ornamented with jewels, although precious stones, in the Middle Ages, were regarded superstitiously.⁷ Upon what finger the betrothal ring was worn is not told.⁸

¹ Cf. *Richars li Biaus*, vv. 5115, 5116; and *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 8335-66 but the *gonfanon* here referred to, is presented by the hero of the poem to Melior.

² Cf. *La Vengeance de Raguidel*, vv. 1327-31. For the ring in other connections than betrothal *vide DE JOINVILLE, Hist. de St. Louis* (ed. J. N. DE WAILLY), pp. 61 and 86 (Paris, 1874), where business contracts are sealed by means of this symbol.

³ Cf. *Amadas et Ydoine*, vv. 5780-97, and G. COQUILLAERT, *Oeuvres*, Vol. II, p. 170 (Paris, 1745); also *Horn*, vv. 2049-55.

⁴ Cf. *Claris et Laris*, vv. 28998-29010; *L'Escoufle*, vv. 4488, 4489; also *Floris et Liriope*, vv. 1139-46; and *Paris et Vienne*, p. 46.

⁵ Cf. *Conte de la Violete*, vv. 884-89, where the ring is represented as having been given at some former time by the man to the woman. Also *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 3333-43, where a man makes a request of a woman through her mother for her *druerie*; cf. also *Flamenza*, vv. 10, 11.

⁶ Cf. *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 4310-4401.

⁷ Cf. *supra*, p. 24, n. 6, as to the kinds of precious stones used in rings. For the magic attributed to rings, *vide Amadas et Ydoine*, vv. 6430-32; also *Floire et Blanceflor*, vv. 1001-8.

⁸ Cf. *Claris et Laris*, v. 29007; the words "son petit anel" refer to the ring then worn by the man, but represented as having been given him at some time previously by his betrothed.

THE RING IN WEDDING.

According to historical tradition, the ring, symbolizing marriage, should be without jewels and perfectly smooth and round.¹ As far as can be seen, the *Romans d'Aventure* denote, by the same descriptive terms, that the wedding ring was as beautiful as the betrothal ring.² The same word is used for both.³ The position of the ring upon the hand is usually designated by a word which means the little finger;⁴ there is no way of telling upon which of the two hands either the betrothal or the wedding ring rested.⁵ The church required the marriage ring to be set on the third finger of the left hand.⁶ The instances showing the wedding ring in the possession of the woman do not represent her, however, as receiving it at the marriage service, although she could come to possess it only in that way.

WEDDING PROCESSION.

The wedding procession to and from the church is the chief feature of all the nuptial ceremonies next to the solemnization of the marriage proper. In classic Roman life the procession of marriage was one of the indispensable ceremonies connected with this rite.⁷ Although the church did not prescribe, in the times of the romances, or ever, the procession of the bridal party, yet the importance and fittingness of this function both to and from the sanctuary is evidence that the adoption of the pagan forms of

¹ Cf. PLINY (ed. K. MAYHOFF, Lips., 1897), *Hist. Nat.*, Vol. XXXIII, cap. 1, §§ 6 and 12; L. FRIEDLAENDER, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, sechste Ausg. (Leipzig, 1888, p. 465).

² The expression "gent anel" is applied to a betrothal ring in *L'Escoufle*, v. 4488, and to a wedding ring in *Comte de Poitiers*, v. 288. Cf. *Aye d'Avignon*, vv. 2000-2, where the marriage ring contains three precious stones.

³ The forms *aniaeus*, *anel*, *anelet*, all occur in the poems, and are used interchangeably of both betrothal and wedding rings. *Bague* is a late medieval word, not found in the romances.

⁴ Cf. W. FOERSTER, *Der Karrenritter* (Halle, 1899), p. 401. In a note to verse 4658 of *Lancelot*, Foerster derives *mame* from *minimus* and identifies it with *manel*, a little finger, upon which a ring was often worn.

⁵ Cf. *La Manékine*, v. 6311, where the heroine of the story has only a right hand upon which to put a ring.

⁶ As late as the Council of Milan, 1576, special direction was given as to which hand should bear the marriage ring: "Non dextræ sed sinistrae manus sponsæ digitis induatur annulo nuptiali."

⁷ Cf. L. FRIEDLANDER, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 466; especially the references in the footnote to the works of KARLOWA, MARQUARDT, and ROSSBACH, respectively. Cf. also N. D. FUSTEL DE COULANGES, *La cité antique* (Paris, 1885), 11th ed., pp. 45, 46.

ceremony in this particular was not distasteful to Christian ideas. The obscene elements were, in part, removed from the Roman customs, and the church countenanced the traditions which obtained in French nuptial processions, just as it had sanctioned the pagan rites of marriage themselves, having adopted and spiritualized the ceremonies of *sponsalia* and *matrimonium*.¹

The romances always give the time of day for a marriage as early morning, between the hours of 6 and 9 A. M., and most often the day of marriage falls in the early summer. The description of some wedding days includes the preliminary merry-making, and the narrative starts with sunrise to maintain the story of the occurrences until the night of the wedding day is far advanced and the guests are fairly wearied with wine and song.² That a formal invitation was sent to the dependents of a ruler is made plain in one romance which represents him as summoning his baronage to appear after a week's notice at the wedding of his chief general.³ There is, however, no regularity expressed by the poets as to the invitation of guests to a wedding; there comes to the festivities usually a great number of nobles who take active part in the proceedings without, apparently, any invitation at all from either the bride or groom.⁴ In the number of those who might be expected with certainty to assist at the wedding a noticeable lack sometimes occurs.⁵ The knights visiting a castle whose lord was to marry did not receive their lodging within the walls of the castle proper, but were entertained at separate houses named *ostels*, bedecked for the occasion, with tapestries and banners, having upon them the armorial bearings of the knights there being entertained.⁶

¹ For an account of Roman observances in wedding processions cf. CATULLUS, LXI (ed. R. ELLIS, London, 1876), pp. 167-92. Also, STATIUS, *Silvae* (ed. F. VOLLMEY, Leipzig, 1898), pp. 61-70.

² Cf. *Galerent*, vv. 6905-18; *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 14904-75; *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 6224-31; *Claris et Laris*, vv. 29611-19.

³ Cf. *L'Escoufle*, vv. 1704-9, and the passage in *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 8435-60, where a written invitation to a wedding (*au nocier*) is sent by messengers to the emperor of Rome. Cf. also *Chevaliers as deus espées*, vv. 5477-83.

⁴ Cf. *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 14938 ff. In *Sone de Nausay*, vv. 17982-89, the wedding festivity is restricted to only noble guests, whereas in *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 6177-80, everyone is admitted freely.

⁵ Cf. *La Manékine*, vv. 2046-70, and *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 14938 ff., where, in each of these cases, the mothers of the grooms are absent from the weddings described.

⁶ Cf. *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 2937-47, and vv. 3441-44.

At a certain moment, probably upon the flourish of trumpets at the castle, the entire bridal company assembled and were arranged according to their various ranks, prior to their departure for the church.¹ There is clear reason to believe that the bride and her ladies passed, in a separate body, to the church and were followed later by the groom and his male friends.² The escorts, however, of the bride, mounted upon a mule or palfrey, were men who, themselves, were also mounted and rode, one on each side of the bride.³ The poets, in their descriptions of these processions,

¹ Cf. *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10759 ff; *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 3441-47; *Chevalier as deus espées*, vv. 5400-61, in which a wedding and coronation procession to a church is given in description; *Clémadès*, vv. 17209-20.

² Cf. *Escanor*, vv. 23021-33; here the groom and bride proceed, apparently, together to the church, but the descriptions found in the romances just cited (*v. supra*, n. 1) give evidence of the separate parties, the bride with her train of attendants passing first, to the church. Cf. also, *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 6073-82, for the account of the ceremony of assisting the brides to alight at the church portal, likewise *vide Gautier d'Aupais*, p. 32.

DESCRIPTION OF A PROCESSION IN A TRIPLE WEDDING FROM *GUILLAUME DE PALERNE* (1212 A. D.).

- I. The entire bridal party, both women and men, is mounted to start toward the church; vv. 8821-35.
- II. The order of procession, from the castle entrance, of the three brides; vv. 8841-57:
 1. Partenidon (escort) *Alexandrine* v. 8841.
 2. King of Spain (escort) *Melior* *Felise* (escort) vv. 8842-46.
 3. Emperor of Germany (escort) *Florence* *Brande* (escort) v. 8847.
- III. Young women, matrons, court ladies, vv. 8833-35.
- IV. Servants carrying staves to clear the way, vv. 8855-57.
- V. The Brides enter the church and are escorted to the high altar, to await the Grooms, vv. 8860-67.
- VI. The Grooms (*Brandin*, *Guillaume*, *Alphonse*) leave the castle and proceed to the church after the brides, v. 8867.
 - a) Priests come out from the church to meet the Grooms.
 - b) Grooms and Priests meet midway to the church.
 - c) Ceremonies in the presence of the Grooms, vv. 8880-96.
- VII. The Grooms enter the church and are escorted to the high altar, to meet the Brides, vv. 8900, 8901.
- VIII. The Wedding Service, vv. 8905-9.
- IX. Coronation Service and Mass, vv. 8914-21.
- X. Return of the bridal party to the castle, in which the men pass first and the women afterward, thus reversing the order of procession from the castle to the church, vv. 8922 ff.

REMARKS: (a) In this procession the presence of women as escorts at the left hand of two of the three brides is noteworthy; in II, 1, the absence of a woman escort for Alexandrine is an oversight of the poet.

(b) In II, 2, the lady escort of Melior is the mother of her groom, Guillaume.

(c) The lady escort of Florence is the step-mother of her groom, Alphonse; cf. II, 3.

(d) In II, 1, Partenidon was to have married the bride who figures in II, 2, but was rejected by her; and after serving in this procession as escort to Alexandrine, returned to his father, the emperor of Greece.

³ Cf. *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 8842-47, where two brides have lady escorts who are the mothers of the two brides respectively.

lay particular emphasis upon the parts taken by the bride and her female attendants, and seem to overlook, nearly, the groom, in their attention to the bride's progress toward the church.¹ This interest concerns itself also with the dress of the bride and the preparation of her wedding costume. Minutely detailed accounts are given of the fabric, its colors, adornments and style.² As soon as the wedding service has been narrated, the poets then describe the return of the company to the castle,³ where the clothing that has been worn before the priest, is exchanged for garments suitable to the banquet-hall.⁴

WEDDING BANQUET.

The feast was spread and all the guests were seated in order,⁵ at tables richly supplied with varied and sometimes marvelous dishes for the delectation of those present.⁶ Amusement was furnished in the form of dance or carol, or the baiting of bears, and games of chess and dice.⁷ Mountebanks mingled their sportiveness, intended perhaps to delight the humbler folk who had gathered at the feast,⁸ with the more serious efforts of the *jongleurs* who chanted their stories after the dinner to the old men seated apart

¹ Cf. *Cléomadès*, vv. 1772-74; *Joufrois de Poitiers*, vv. 926-41. One of the salient characteristics of the *Romans d'Aventure*, as contrasted with the *Chansons de Geste*, is the attention paid by the poet to the bride in the wedding ceremonies; cf. T. KRABBE'S, "Die Frau im alfranzösischen Karls-Epos" in E. STENGEL's *Ausg. u. Abh.*, XVIII (1884), pp. 41, 42.

² Cf. *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 4711-15; *Escanor*, vv. 23036-39; *Comte de Poitiers*, vv. 908-25. Cf. also A. J. V. LE ROUX DE LINCY, *Les femmes célèbres de l'ancienne France* (Paris, 1858), Vol. I, pp. 47-54, and E. LAMESAUGÈRE, *Costumes des femmes françaises du XII^e au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1827), p. 47; M. A. RACINET, *Costume Historique* (3^e Livraison, *Europe - Le Moyen-Âge*), Paris, 1876-88. Occasionally a woman is said to wear a bridal crown; cf. *Galerent*, vv. 6887, 6888: "Puis li a sur sa sore teste, Une cercle estroicté d'or miso." Also *L'Escoufle*, vv. 8288, 8289: "Ele ot la blonde teste nue, Fors d'un cercle d'or a rubis."

³ Cf. *Sone de Nausay*, vv. 17035-17130.

⁴ Cf. *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 4755-58; and *La Manékine*, vv. 2321-23.

⁵ Cf. *Floir et Blanceflor*, vv. 2843-78.

⁶ *Ibid.*, vv. 2874-78.

⁷ Cf. A. SCHULTZ, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 576; *Escanor*, vv. 23021-29, and *Le Chevalier à l'Epée*, vv. 788-806.

⁸ Cf. *Florian et Florete*, vv. 6057-60. Clowns and tumblers here form a part of the wedding cortège and doubtless serve to amuse the crowd at the banquet-hall as well. Noise of all kinds, the ringing of bells and very loud music characterize all the marriage occasions of the *Romans d'Aventure*. The sounds produced by the infinite variety of wind, string, and percussion instruments are likened by the poets to the thunders of heaven making a whole city tremble. Cf. *Histoire littéraire de la France* (Paris, 1842), Vol. XX, pp. 714-716, where a description of mediæval instruments of music is found.

in the hall and listening to the noble deeds of heroes long since past.¹ In this manner the afternoon wore into the evening of the wedding day and the evening into the late night, which found the guests still lingering around the board, or in the hall, until feast turned to revel. At length the bride was conducted to the nuptial chamber, where she was prepared by her lady attendants to receive her groom. Then occurred the benediction of the priest, who sprinkled with holy water the nuptial couch.²

WEDDING GIFT.

On the morrow in the early morning, was the time for gifts from the guests to the bride and the groom.³ Whether the groom gave the bride a present, or *vice versa*, is not plain from the data supplied by the *Romans d'Aventure*.⁴ Lavish gifts to the church are mentioned as being made by the bridal company, and are placed upon the altars for the priests to distribute later among the needy, not reserving any portion of the offering for themselves.

As with any of the functions of marriage that have been considered thus far, and the nature of their development, upon Christian soil in France, out of the pagan character possessed by them in Roman life, it is to be noticed, as well also in the matter of wedding gifts, that Germanic influences have not interfered appreciably with Roman tradition.⁵ The *donum matutinale* is referred to indistinctly in several romances and but one instance points definitely to this Germanic custom.⁶ On this first morning after

¹ Cf. *Claris et Laris*, vv. 29611-19.

² Cf. *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 3456, 3457; *Cléomadès*, vv. 17244-68; *L'Atre périlleux*, vv. 6637-42.

³ Cf. *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 5502-10; *Claris et Laris*, vv. 29673-81. Cf. also *Amadis de Gaule* (Lyon, 1588), Bk. IV, cap. iii, pp. 338, 339.

⁴ Cf. *La Manékine*, vv. 2345-60; *Cléomadès*, vv. 18017-30.

⁵ Cf. LAISNEL DE LA SALLE, *op. cit.*, p. 31; also E. BELLOGUET, *Ethnogénie gauloise* (Paris, 1861-73), Vol. III, p. 390, and L. FALLUE, *Conquête des Gaules* (Paris, 1862), p. 195-99.

⁶ Cf. E. LABOULAYE, *Condition civile et politique des femmes* (Paris, 1843), pp. 117-35; *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 6232-88; and *Cléomadès*, vv. 17708-12. The influence of the church upon the institution of *Morgengabe* made itself felt in the conversion of the *pretium matutinale* into the dowry; in the *Histoire des France*, dowry and *pretium* are synonymous; cf. GUIZOT, *Mémoires sur l'Histoire de France* (Paris, 1823) Vol. II, p. 30, and footnote. French poetry affords an instance of the primitive character of the *pretium* in Merovingian times; cf. *La Vie de Saint Alexia*, vv. 41-45 (G. PARIS, ed.), Paris, 1872, Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes-Études, Vol. VII.

the wedding day the bride and groom attended mass at the church, but there is no special ceremony connected with this event to need any elaboration at the poet's hands. The festivities subsequent to the wedding-day pleasures are not described in detail, but almost invariably the poems narrate how many days were taken up in celebrating the marriage at large. The length of time in which the visitors to the scene of the wedding are represented as remaining, varies between four days and sixty days,¹ usually, however, the guests and their hosts celebrate the occasion during one week, after which all take leave of the young husband and wife, wishing them happiness.

TIME OF WEDDING.

The festival days of most importance as indicated by the *Romans d'Aventure* are, in the order in which they occur during the year: *Pâques*, *Pentecôte*, *Toussaint*, *Noël*, and of these the first two are the most often mentioned.² These were all festival days of the church, lending themselves readily to the elaborate ceremonial of a royal or noble wedding. In contrast to the regular church seasons of religious festival, during which marriages were often solemnized, there were periods of the year in which a wedding was forbidden by the church.³ From Septuagesima until after Easter, and three days before St. John's Day, and also from Advent until Epiphany the church refused to bless nuptials.⁴ Doubtless these seasons were intended for fasting which terminated by general rejoicing on the feast days already designated.⁵ Like the Romans, the French of the time in which fall the *Romans d'Aventure*, preferred the month of June for the celebration of weddings, whereas the month of May

¹ Cf. *Cléomadès*, in which poem the festivities lasted only four days, while in *Floriant et Florete*, sixty days elapse.

² Other feast days are mentioned in the romances, especially "Jour de l'Ascension" and "Jour de Saint-Jean; cf. *Lancelot*, v. 31; *Fergus*, v. 6916; *Erec et Enide*, v. 27.

³ Cf. J. SIRMOND, *Concilia antique Galliae* (Paris, 1629), p. 594; here, marriages are not allowed on Sundays because of the special reverence to be paid to that day.

⁴ Cf. MARTÈNE ET DURAND, *Thesaurus Nov. Aneç*. (Paris, 1717), col. 872, where, in the Gallican church, no marriage celebration was permitted during Advent.

⁵ Cf. *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10127, 10128: "Vigil ert de l'Asension, Que par costume june l'on," i. e., Rogation week.

was commonly regarded as untimely.¹ That May was an ill-omened month for a marriage seems, however, to have been only a popular idea of the lower classes during the Middle Ages² since numerous references are given in the *Romans d'Aventure* to weddings celebrated both on Ascension Day and at Pentecost.³ Other seasons of the year referred to as times in which weddings took place are July and Christmas.⁴ As the church was largely influential in the arrangement of the seasons for marriage, it is safe to infer that, where in the *Romans d'Aventure* no time of year is set down by the poet, the marriage he is describing fell upon some one of these important festivals.⁵

Since the anniversary of a church festival did not recur upon a fixed day of the week in each year a marriage ceremony of the nobles might happen upon any day on which that festival came. In the case of *Pâques* and *Pentecôte* also *Saint-Jean* and *Noël* the day varies from year to year. It is therefore difficult to say, from the data in the romances, just what specific days of the week were, or were not, acceptable for marriage from whatever point of view.⁶ There are several instances noted in which Sunday is a day of wedding, notwithstanding the probable inconvenience involved to the priests, whose work in the usual mass celebrations incident to that day must have tended to prevent nuptials.⁷ It is very likely that Wednesday and Friday were not

¹ Cf. "De veteri rite nuptiarum observatio" in GRÆVIUS; *Thes. Ant. Rom.* (Paris, 1698), where it is shown that neither May nor February, nor the three days of March when the feast of the Salii was celebrated, were fitting times for marriage at Rome, but during June was the most favorable period. For references to St. John's Day in this connection cf. *Chevaliers as deus espées*, vv. 5260-63, and J. GRIMM, *Deutsche Mythologie*, 4te Aufl. (Berlin, 1875), Vol. I., pp. 513-15.

² Cf. G. LAISNEL DE LA SALLE, *Croyances et légendes du centre de la France* (Paris, 1875), p. 21; also *Romania* (1880), pp. 547-70, in particular, p. 547, footnote 3.

³ Cf. *La Manéchine*, vv. 2077-80; *Flamenca*, vv. 184, 185. It will be remembered, also, that the marriage of the Doges with the Adriatic occurred on Ascension Day.

⁴ Cf. *Ille et Galeron*, vv. 3962-69; *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 5272-83; *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 6111, 6112: "Au chief de l'an."

⁵ In marriages of the Roman times the Calends, Nones, and Ides and all festival days, save for widows, were suitable for weddings; cf. MACROBIUS, *Conv. Saturn* (F. EYSENHARDT, ed.), I, XV, 21, 22 (Lips., 1893). For the Christian festivals cf. L. DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien* (2d ed., Paris, 1898), cap. vii, pp. 218-90.

⁶ Cf. A. L. A. FRANKLIN, *La vie privée d'autrefois* (Paris, 1888), Vol. XVII, p. 34, and *Romania*, loc. cit., p. 548, n. 1.

⁷ Cf. *supra*, p. 31, n. 3; also *Galerent*, v. 6706, and *Flamenca*, vv. 247, 248. In *Raoul de Cambrai*, vv. 6069, 6070, Sunday is given as a wedding day.

acceptable days for marriage; but that Thursday and Saturday were suitable seems clear.¹

Upon the point of the time of day for a wedding the romances generally coincide; the custom described by the poets of a marriage at early dawn occurs commonly.² This part of the day was usual in Roman weddings in the late empire.³ The early morning, or at least before noonday, was the proper time of weddings in France, and the custom may have been adopted from Roman usage, or, what is more likely, this time was due to the requirements of the church which ordered the solemnization of a sacrament by a fast from the middle of the night of the day on which the marriage was to occur.⁴ Certain weddings are mentioned as occurring at other hours than the very beginning of day, but these are rare.⁵ In a reckoning by number of the romances which refer at all to the time of day of a wedding celebration, four state simply at sunrise and two at 9 and 12 o'clock respectively.⁶

There are numerous romances that refer to a church building as the scene of a wedding. Excepting those marriages celebrated in castles, the general course taken was for the bridal party to form a procession and arrive before the church portal.⁷ The edifice, thus reached, although an important enough factor in the ceremonies, does not receive more than a passing mention from the poet.⁸ The description goes no farther than to say that the church was *long and wide* or that it was situated near some open

¹ Cf. *supra*, p. 32, n. 7; Saturday as a day of consecration to the Virgin Mary was a favorable day for marriage. In the *Romance of Mélusine* Monday is a wedding day, and in *Hugues Capet* Thursday is given.

² Cf. *Richars li Biaus*, vv. 3957, 3958; *Fergus*, vv. 6905-8; *Joufrois de Poitiers*, vv. 3507-9; *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 14938, 14939.

³ Cf. L. FRIEDLAENDER, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 466.

⁴ The romances show that this fasting after midnight of the wedding day was not always observed: cf. *Joufrois de Poitiers*, vv. 2103-17; *Chevalier au Cygne*, vv. 172-78.

⁵ Cf. *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10432-34; *Flamenca*, v. 295; *Guillaume de Palerne*, v. 3339: Here the father of the bride grows angry over the delay of a wedding, complaining that it is already 9 A. M. (tierce).

⁶ Cf. *Flamenca*, v. 295; the time of this context is midday for the wedding, and the groom displays his impatience seemingly at the delay; he is represented as very happy when the service was over and the affair "done with," as the poet implies.

⁷ Cf. *Richars li Biaus*, vv. 410 ff.; *Flore et Jehanne*, p. 97; *Sone de Nausay*, vv. 17017-54; *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 4724-41, and *supra*, p. 22, n. 2.

⁸The words used for church building in the poems, are: "glise," "mestre glise," "le plus mestre glise," "li plus rice mostier majour," etc.

place or square.¹ Bells are referred to in the narratives, and are always designated as *saints* possibly because of the name, inscribed on the bell, of the patron saint of the church.² Where a ceremony is referred to as occurring in a castle, the same religious formalities may be supposed for the secular places as were prescribed for a church edifice. The officiant in a castle is entitled *chapelains*, and the place of his functions is called *chapelle*.³ What part the church portal played in the celebrating of a wedding service is not to be gathered from the romances.⁴

BENEDICTIO THALAMI.

The ceremony, practiced during the Middle Ages in the Romish church, of sprinkling a bridal bed is founded upon classic tradition. The romance of *Éracles*, of Greek origin,⁵ shows the bride as bathing two whole days before her marriage,⁶ conformably with Greek religious custom, where bathing of the body, entire, was practiced.⁷ As to Roman observances on this point, the use of running water was made with which to sprinkle the bride, or in fact to wash the feet of the bride and groom as a substitute for the Greek practice, but symbolical also of the idea of purity which bathing conveyed to the Greeks.⁸ This pagan rite with its underlying motive received acceptance also in

¹Cf. *Clémades*, vv. 17784, 17765; *Guillaume de Dole*, vv. 4984, 4985: "Au moustier mon seignor S. Pierre, Qui ert coverz de fuelle[s] d'ierre;" *Fergus*, vv. 5730, 5731: "Devant la tour a.l. moustier, Ki ert molt nobles et molt chier."

²The names of the churches as given are, among the rest: S. Danmartin, S. Martin, S. Moysant, S. Nicholas, S. Piere, S. Pol, S. Wast. Authorities differ with respect to the origin of the Old French *saint = cloche*; in *Romania*, XVII (1888), p. 188, M. Paris derives the word from the Latin *signum* and not from *sanctum*, an error, as he affirms, handed down from mediæval times, although he does not give any proof for his support of the former etymon. No patroness saints are recorded in connection with the names of a church. As to bells, cf. *L'Escoufe*, vv. 3315 and 8845.

³Cf. *La Manékine*, v. 2032; *Le comte d'Artois*, p. 15; also VIOLET-LE-DUC, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 103. In *L'Escoufe*, v. 8215, "Les églises del castel" occurs.

⁴Cf. A. CHÉREUEL, *Dictionnaire historique*, Vol. II (Paris, 1855), p. 735, and BEAUCHET, *op. cit.*, p. 41, n. 3.

⁵Cf. PARIS, *Manuel d'ancien Français* (Paris, 1890), p. 82.

⁶Cf. E. LÖSETH, *Éracles* (Paris, 1890), p. 31.

⁷Cf. EURIPIDES' *Phénissae* (DINDORF, ed., Oxford, 1882), vv. 344-49, p. 117; and the *Scholia Græca* (*ibid.*, Oxford, 1863), Vol. III, p. 126; also ARISTOPHANES, *Comœdiae* (ed. HALL ET GELDART, Oxford, 1900), Vol. II, vv. 377, 378 of the *Lyaistrata*.

⁸Cf. A. ROSSBACH, *Untersuchungen über die römische Ehe* (Stuttgart, 1853), p. 366; FESTUS, *De verborum significatione*, Bk. VI; THILO ET HAGEN, *Servius, Commentarii in Vergilium* (Lips., 1881), p. 493.

Christian ceremonial. Just in what manner the priest's blessing, and the use of water, came in as a church function could not be entered upon here, though the custom is referred to very early.¹ The examples of bed-blessing are few in Old-French poetry; still they do occur, at intervals, until the later prose romances.² The *Romans d'Aventure* exhibit what may be two forms of the bed ceremony: one, where the priest blesses the couple as they lie together in bed;³ the other, where the bride is ushered into the nuptial chamber by her relatives or her attendants.⁴ Of the former manner of bed-blessing there are four examples given, whereas of the latter there are but two.⁵ This second class shows the priest as having completed the benediction⁶ before the bridegroom appears at the chamber door.⁷ One instance of a bed-blessing ceremony which gives an illustration of the scene together with the text, represents in the picture both bride and groom in bed at once, about to receive the *benedictio thalami*, but the narrative implies that the bride was put to bed first by her women attendants, and, after they had left the chamber, the groom entered and prepared himself to retire in time to receive the blessing of the priest when he appeared. Whatever the precise order of events prescribed, whether the bride alone received lustration, as seems to have been the case at Rome, or whether bride and groom had to be sprinkled as they were in bed is not

¹ Cf. *Le Fresne*, vv. 415-20, and *Anseis de Carthage*, vv. 720-35; also *Gaufrey*, vv. 7416, 7417. In *MARTÈNE*, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 616, 617, the sprinkling of the groom and bride is referred to as the pair enter the church.

² Cf. *Comte d'Artois*, p. 27; also *Mélusine* (*Bibl. Elzév.*, Vol. LXXIV), pp. 64, 65 (Paris, 1854).

³ It was usual in the Middle Ages for both refined and common people alike to wear no night clothing in bed; on this point cf. *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, vv. 1214, 1215 and 1279, 1280; *Durmars li Galois*, v. 15162. For the description of a bed cf. *La Vengeance de Raguidel*, vv. 3667-70.

⁴ Cf. *Claris et Laris*, vv. 29654-60; *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 6261-81; *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 4785-99; in this example, the priest blessed the bed even before the bride and groom had retired and while it was yet empty. Cf. also *L'Escoufle*, vv. 1739-46, and *Cligès*, vv. 3329-35, and *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 15155-60.

⁵ J. BARROIS, *Li livre du très chevalereux comte d'Artois* (Paris, 1837), p. 27.

⁶ Cf. *MARTÈNE*, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 622, 623, under *Benedictio thalami*: "Benedic, domine, thalamum hunc et omnes habitantes in eo ut in tua pace consistant et in tua voluntate permaneant et in amore tuo vivant et senescant et multiplicentur in longitudinem dierum. Per."

⁷ Cf. *Jehan et Blonde*, v. 4791; in this context there is a curious account of the groom searching about at the entrance to the chamber in order to assure himself that there are no intruders near.

to be determined from the romances. In connection with this ceremony notice should be taken of a substitute for the lustration observance which was adopted later as a more refined form of procedure, namely, the use of the *abrifol* in wedding celebrations.¹ Two *Romans d'Aventure* refer to this covering for the bride and groom as they stood before the priest.²

MORAL STANDARD IN BETROTHAL.

In order to fill out the discussion of the content of the *Romans d'Aventure* with reference to the general subject, it is necessary to take account of the moral attitude of a bride to a groom and of husband to wife, as it is represented in the words of the poets. If, as is usually accepted, the *Romans d'Aventure* were meant for the pleasure, specially, of women rather than men, it is allowable to suppose that these poems, broadly considered, represent a higher moral standard than otherwise might be, on that account.³ Only the more salient features of this part of the subject can be noted, for the reason that the data are too complex to admit of minute classification. In the first place, a question of almost moral import, for those times, arising in the minds of women about to marry was the rank of their lovers.⁴ A favorite situation with the poets is to represent a young man, apparently of obscure origin, brought by accident into acquaintanceship with

¹Cf. J. BRAND, *Popular Antiquities* (ed. H. ELLIS, London, 1843), Vol. II, pp. 141-43.

²Cf. *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10822, 10823; "Trois chiers palies tint on desus, Si comme costume est et us;" *Sone de Nausay*, vv. 17893-99. Also cf. MARTENE, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 624, where the use of carecloth is mentioned in a church ceremonial before 400 A. D. Lustration and the *abrifol* may, therefore, have gone along, side by side, and the latter ceremony must have survived owing to the more seemly character of the ceremonial; cf. L. DUCHESNE, *op. cit.*, p. 417, and J. BOLLAND, "Acta Sanctorum," *Vita S. Emmerammi* (Paris, 1867), Vol. VI, p. 497, col. 1.

³Cf. *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 6255 and 6255-63; here the poet expresses a subjective view of chastity which may be discounted in view of the fact that it appears to be, in the underlying motive of the poem, rather a prejudice. Cf. also *Richars li Biaus*, vv. 4105-12 and 4120-25.

⁴Cf. *Escanor*, vv. 9307-24; *Comte de Poitiers*, vv. 879-81 and 84-88. A jealous mother is shown to remonstrate with her husband concerning the subject of disparity in rank even if the daughter does not object; cf. *Flore et Jehanne*, pp. 94, 95. In like manner, the inferiority of the woman brings about the same objections as in the case of the man; cf. *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 860-70; *Chevaliers as deus espées*, vv. 2822-35; *Galerent*, vv. 1617-26; *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, vv. 1134-60. Cf. also *La chasteclaine de Saint-Gille*, p. 23, where a noblewoman exclaims against a plan of marriage where her rank is involved: *J'aim miez un chapelet de flors que mauves mariage*. In this same connection cf. P. RAJNA, *Le Corti di Amore* (Milano, 1890), pp. 20 and 66.

a woman of noble birth. This woman in the course of time becomes enamored of him, and then there follows in the poem a soliloquy from her which usually exhibits the struggle between love and duty.¹

The character of the love which a man holds for a woman and a woman for a man is generally refined, and, within the limitations of the morality pertaining to those times, sincere.² While the woman is the more susceptible to love, the man does not always conceal his feelings.³ Each one is represented as maintaining an ideal of the other in their minds.⁴ Integrity of life in a woman before her marriage and constancy to her betrothal vow, are, in some *Romans d'Aventure* the whole fabric of the story.⁵ Parental or other control, which often determined for a woman just who her lover should be, in spite of her own preferences,⁶ is recorded, in the poems, as either set wholly aside, or thwarted by means of ingenious stratagem.⁷ The young woman, however, is generally allowed to go on her own way in such circumstances, and as the poem nears the end receives forgiveness for her indiscretion.⁸ That the betrothal pledge, whether made by the two lovers in secret or openly, was considered inviolable, is very clear in the

¹ Cf. *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 1574-56; *L'Escoufle*, vv. 2890-92.

² Cf. *Méraugis de Portlesguez*, vv. 1113-19. The instances of moral laxity such as are found in *Joufroi*, vv. 4407-9 and 3949-4007, and in *Conte de la Violete*, vv. 3921-34, also, *L'Escoufle*, vv. 3284-87 are not at all examples of refined manners, although they do not vitiate the fidelity of the lovers to each other but rather indicate the strength of it; in the courtship of Guillaume and Aëlis, the hero of this last-mentioned poem is made to say to the emperor who wished to take his daughter away from the young man: "Bien saciés sous son bliaut de Sire," and a little farther on the girl explains innocently: "Tantes foies que ma main ne s'ose Muchier aves mis Vos beles mains qui sont si blanches A cest bel ventre et a ces hanches Et tasté mon cors en tes sens!"

³ Cf. *La Vengeance de Raguidel*, vv. 1323-27 and 1331, 1332; *Fergus*, vv. 1848-56; *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 3927-33; cf. *Claris et Laris*, vv. 15202-15; here, the hero dilates on the matter of his love in thirteen verses, each line beginning with the word *Amours*.

⁴ Cf. *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 9397-9410, and vv. 9343-72.

⁵ These poems are: *Guillaume de Palerne*, *Conte de la Violete*, *Joufroi de Poitiers*, *Anadas et Ydoine, Comtesse de Ponthieu*. Cf. *Anglia*, Vol. VI (1883), pp. 1-46.

⁶ Cf. *Floris et Liriope*, vv. 977, 978.

⁷ Cf. *La Manékine*, vv. 726-29, where the heroine chops off her left hand to avoid a marriage with her own father, a union which the clergy for some reason had sanctioned. Other cases of elusion are cited in *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 3589-3613, and *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 5571-74.

⁸ Cf. *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 1141, 1142, for an example of the freedom exercised by a single woman as against that of a girl in Roman times, before her marriage, as given by FRIEDLAENDER, *op. cit.*, p. 464. Cf. also *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 5359-61.

*Romans d'Aventure.*¹ Should an engagement by any chance have to be cancelled, an indemnity was obligatory.² The unmarried women of the *Romans d'Aventure* appear to disadvantage when compared with those of the modern world, particularly with reference to their obvious boldness in approaching a man about marriage and in making open their minds first to him about their love.³ There seemed to be more deference required by a young unmarried woman than by women who were married.⁴

The motives which actuated a man contemplating marriage are most commonly set down as material; this is true also of the woman, in her relation to the man.⁵ Yet above these mercenary incentives there rested a religious spirit of a sort which served to deter improper unions, and it is usually the woman who gives evidence of this.⁶

MORAL STANDARD IN MARRIAGE.

In the *Romans d'Aventure* the word *druerie*⁷ connotes incest,⁸ or a marriage not in keeping with decency,⁹ or, on the other hand, this word defines a perfectly proper relation of a man towards a woman.¹⁰ So also *drus* and *drue* possess the meaning of lover in

¹ Cf. *Galerent*, vv. 6822-73; *Cléomadès*, 4740-44. Other cases of this same kind are exemplified in *Galerent*, vv. 2373-79; *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 1893-95; *Livre de Baudoin*, pp. 145, 146; *Ipomédon*, vv. 10501, 10502 and 10511, 10512. In a very late romance the same element is found; cf. *Jean de Paris* (ed. MABILLE, Paris, 1855; Bibl. Etzv.), pp. 115, 116.

² Cf. *Flore et Jehanne*, p. 96, and P. CHABRIT, *De la Monarchie françoise ou de ses loix* (Paris, 1783), Vol. I, p. 189.

³ Cf. A. MÉRAY, *La vie au temps des Cours d'Amours* (Paris, 1876), p. 217. It is to be noticed that a young woman, in spite of her proposal to marriage, declares against taking the first step; cf. *Fergus*, vv. 1855, 1856: "Miex vauroie estre mise en biere, Que primes d'amour le requiere;" also *Ille et Galeron*, vv. 3349-58.

⁴ Cf. *Galerent*, vv. 5343-59; *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 10273-78; *Blancandin et l'Orgueiluse d'Amour*, vv. 700-22; also *Amadis de Gaule*, Bk. IV (Lyons, 1588), pp. 290, 291.

⁵ Cf. *Comte d'Artois*, p. 83, and *Li livre de Baudoin*, p. 45, in which a woman exclaims: "il ne me chausse le mary que j'auray n'est gueres riche; car je le suis asses, je ne demande fors qu'il desperte mes ultrages. Cf. also *Ille et Galeron*, vv. 6523-28 and 6547-51.

⁶ Cf. *Cléomadès*, vv. 7121-32; *La Manekine*, vv. 555, 710, 711; *Galerent*, vv. 3196, 3197; *Sone de Nausay*, vv. 2735-50. The citation from *Cléomadès* referred to here, reveals the poet as lauding the good old days when men married for love and not for the marriage portion; in the *Chevalier à l'épée*, vv. 776-79, is given an instance of what the Flemish minstrel Adene_t le Roi yearns for in *Cléomadès*.

⁷ Cf. KOERTING, *Etyms. WBuch.*, s. v., not a Celtic word but from a German stem.

⁸ Cf. *Richars li Biaus*, vv. 741 and 5032.

⁹ Cf. *Partonopeus de Blois*, vv. 9409-12; *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, vv. 1119-29.

¹⁰ Cf. *Comte de Poitiers*, v. 986; also *Richars li Biaus*, v. 5008; this context affords a clear contrast of proper and improper love as expressed in the term *druerie*.

good and bad senses.¹ The relation, of a man about to marry, to the woman is expressed in a variety of ways,² and the names for husband³ and wife are several.⁴ As indicative of endearment, either before or after marriage, the words *ami* and *amie* are preferred.⁵

The relation of the sexes either before or after married life begins is not always ideal in the *Romans d'Aventure*. There are scenes portrayed reflecting the moral condition of those times, which exhibit both good and bad tendencies.⁶ Whether the romances are accurate to the letter in their delineation of life in this particular it is difficult to determine.⁷ There is no doubt that felicity in married life among the nobles, of whom these poems treat, was attained and fostered to an extent closely approaching modern ideas.⁸ When a woman is represented as seeking the company of some man other than her own husband, it is because either his age or jealous nature makes life a burden to her and to himself alike.⁹ The penalty for breach of the marriage vows by a

¹ Cf. *L'Escoufle*, vv. 4420, 4421; *Ipomedon*, v. 2993; *Comte de Poitiers*, v. 1102; *Lai de Melion* (ed. F. MICHEL, Paris, 1840), p. 47.

² Cf. *Guillaume de Palerne*, v. 8767, where a man is said to take a woman in marriage "A per, a feme et a compaigne; *Blancandin et l'Orgueilleuse d'Amour*; v. 3517; "Puis vous prenderei a moillier;" *Roman de Mahomet*, p. 21: "Sa dame a femme prent."

³ The words, *mari*, *baron* in *La Manékine*, v. 523: "De mes barons baron vous doing"; *sires*, in *Escaror*, v. 340, occur in the meaning of husband.

⁴ The terms, *femme* and *dame* (*Galerent*, vv. 1585, 1586: "Dame seray de sa maison, Sa femme et sa loyal espouse;" *moiller*, *La Manékine*, v. 2306; *oissor*, *L'Escoufle*, v. 2175, are employed interchangeably for "wife."

⁵ Cf. *Cligès*, vv. 1392-97; *Claris et Laris*, v. 29662; *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 1139-41.

⁶ Cf. *Amadas et Ydoine*, vv. 1980 ff.; *Éracles*, vv. 2954-57; *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 15713 ff.; *Lai du Cor*, vv. 345-48; *Livre de Baudoyen*, p. 144—these are examples of good morals. *L'Escoufle*, vv. 6531-40, 7880 ff.; *Joufrain de Poitiers*, vv. 3949-4007; *Comte de la Violette*, vv. 735-46; *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 1511-48; *Flamenca*, vv. 6885-73, are instances of questionable manners.

⁷ Cf. A. SCHULTZ, op. cit., pp. 530-32 and 595-613; E. DE LA BEDOLLIÈRE, *Histoire des mœurs et de la vie privée des Français* (Paris, 1847), Vol. II, p. 186.

⁸ Cf. *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 33-35, 38-45, 14875 ff.; *La Manékine*, vv. 2433 ff. and 6374. Exhortations from parents to their newly married daughters to "love, honor, and obey" their husbands appear in *Cléomadès*, vv. 18199-18207, and *Guillaume de Palerne*, vv. 9019-38 and 9067-76.

⁹ Unconscionable disparity in the ages of a man and woman at marriage is shown occasionally in the poems: cf. *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, vv. 1263-70; *Durmars li Galois*, vv. 121 and 148 ff. For an instance of a disagreeable husband as the cause of separation from his wife cf. *Flamenca*, vv. 3240-49, and *Roman de la Poire*, vv. 1422-30.

married woman was unusually severe.¹ Of divorce, as it is known today, there are no real cases in the *Romans d'Aventure*, although several examples are found which make clear that a separation of body could be consummated on sufficient grounds with regard either to husband or wife.²

The names of certain saints are mentioned in connections where goodly offices are needed by married women in their behalf. The Virgin Mary appears to be, in the romances, a tutelary genius of married women and protectress of orphans unmarried.³

As between the twelfth century and the thirteenth, concerning morality at large it is known that the former period was inferior in standard to the latter. The literature of both centuries offers this contrast, however, in that the earlier period ingenuously confesses the truth about itself in the *Chansons de Geste* whilst the thirteenth and following centuries cannot claim more than a guarded and self-conscious statement of the truth for its poets. This renders it difficult to determine just how far the *Romans d'Aventure* may be relied on to have reproduced the actual moral life of the age of their writers. In other particulars, it seems safe to believe the facts as to that which these *trouvères* have described in their writings on affairs of daily life and on the

¹Cf. *Joufrois de Poitiers*, vv. 240 ff., and *Bisclarvet* (ed. K. WARNKE), Halle, 1900, vv. 231-35.

²Cf. *Éracles*, vv. 5005 ff.; *Flamenca*, vv. 6688 ff.; *Jehan et Blonde*, vv. 5343, 5344; *Amadas et Ydoine*, vv. 7275 ff. Sometimes the repudiation of a wife by her husband occurs after the manner of Roman custom; cf. *Flore et Jehanne*, pp. 120, 121. The Old French *désavènement* was confused subsequently with divorce, but falsely, because the former word denotes the simple authorization of the church for a separation of body, without any liberty for either party to marry again; cf. GUIZOT, *Hist. de la civilisation en France* (Paris, 1872), p. 128. Cf. also *Etiéduc* (ed. K. WARNKE), Halle, 1900, vv. 1120-30. In *Guillaume le Maréchal*, which is not fiction but history, may be seen how the demands of feudal life could override church regulations concerning repudiation and could obviously force a procedure "contre sainte église;" cf. this poem of the middle of the twelfth century in *Romania*, XI, 1882, p. 52, vv. 370-80; also M. MEYER's comments, *ibid.*, pp. 42, 43.

³Cf. *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, vv. 496-502, where a mother in the throes of childbirth prays Holy Mary for aid; *Comte de Poitiers*, vv. 423 ff., in which a woman invokes the Virgin to witness to her purity as the wife of the count. Cf. also the expressions in *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 5038-40: "En l'église sainte Marie, Qui les orphelines marie;" *Claris et Laris* vv. 8485, 8486: "La tres douce virgo Marie, Qui les orfelines marie." A newly married queen is represented as honoring the Holy Mother in her daily life, and following her example by marrying off poor but refined women; cf. *La Manéchine*, vv. 2433-35: "Povres gentils femmes marie, Mout par demaine sainte vie Ele honneroit Dieu et sa mere." In the poem *Éracles*, vv. 2954-57 and 2966, 2967 the same is said of Queen Athenais just after her marriage: "Messe fait chanter et matines, Et fait nourrir ces orfelines, Pour l'amour Deu, le fil Marie Et Pour l'amour Deu les marie."

customs of the nobility class especially with which they came into closer contact than did any other profession.¹

The writer intends to give, in a future contribution, the results of an investigation, similar in character to this present one, but concerned with mediæval German betrothal and nuptial rites and based upon a survey of Middle High German literature and the German laws incident to these ceremonials in the Middle Ages.

F. L. CRITCHLOW.

PRINCETON, N. J.

¹Cf. *Histoire littéraire*, Vol. XXII, pp. 841-51; W. P. KER, *Epic and Romance* (London, 1897), pp. 375 ff. and 393; H. MICHELANT, Introductions to: *Blancandin* (Paris, 1867), *Guillaume de Palerne* (Paris, 1876), and *Eescanor* (Tübingen, 1886).



ENGLISH DRAMATIC COMPANIES IN THE TOWNS OUTSIDE OF LONDON, 1550-1600.

DURING the first half of the sixteenth century we find two general classes of actors in England, those who depended on their acting for a living, and those who acted only a few times a year and did not depend on their acting for a livelihood; the first class we may call the "professional players;" the second, "the amateur players." By 1550, however, the professional players had to a large extent superseded the amateur players, and the danger of the comparatively incompetent acting of the amateur players (they had both less time and less incentive to practice their art than the professional players) arresting our drama at the miracle- and morality-stage, had been averted.

Though the main reason for this triumph of the professional players is probably to be found in the confirmation of the hostile attitude of the stricter churchmen toward the miracle- and morality-plays—with which the amateur players were mainly concerned—by the growing Protestant sentiment, still the custom of traveling for the purpose of giving performances at the principal provincial towns, instituted by the professional companies, was of considerable importance in bringing it about. If the town authorities desired a play given, not only was it less trouble to hire a professional company than to train a number of citizens for the performance, but, as a rule, it was also less expensive and the work was more satisfactorily done. It is not surprising, then, to find that after the middle of the sixteenth century practically all dramatic performances given in England were in the hands of the professional companies, and that they came to look upon their tours through the country as a by no means unimportant or unrewarding part of their work.

It is the object of this paper to give some account of the customs of these companies—their methods of performance, their relations to the town authorities, the amounts they were paid, etc., while touring the towns outside of London from 1550 to 1600.

Before attempting this, however, it may be well to point out that, in spite of the growing Protestant sentiment against plays and players and the hostile attitude of the stricter churchmen, the popularity of the drama during these years was very great. This is conclusively shown, not only by the number of performances of which we have record, but also by the fact that during these years we find notices in the town accounts of Leicester, Nottingham, Oxford, Shrewsbury, Bristol, Doncaster, Plymouth, Beverley, Bath, and Stratford-on-Avon of no less than fifty-six dramatic companies. That these companies were all distinct and, as regards individual actors, mutually exclusive, is highly improbable, for we know it was the custom of the players to pass from one company to another and for the companies to change their names with a change of patron. So under different company names we may be dealing with the same actors. But, even allowing for this, the number of actors in England during the half-century must have been very great, and Walsingham's statement that in 1586 there were two hundred players in or near London¹ is probably no exaggeration. The existence of so large a body of players, who depended upon their profession for a living, can be accounted for only by supposing a widespread popularity of dramatic performances during these years.

The dramatic companies which visited the provincial towns fall naturally into three classes: First, the companies which performed in London as well as in the country towns. They were always under the patronage of royalty or some great nobleman. I have called them the "London Companies." In this division may be classed the Children of the Chapel Royal who acted in Leicester in 1591.² Secondly, the companies which performed in the country towns, but not in London, and were under the patronage of some nobleman or great commoner. I have called them the "Noblemen's Companies." Thirdly, those companies which bore the name of some town. They never acted in London, but traveled over the country, acting in various towns. I have called them the "Town Companies."

¹ Quoted in *Lights of the Old English Stage* (New York: Appleton & Co., 1878), p. 8.

² W. KELLY, *Notices of Leicester* (London, 1865), p. 226.

In addition to these more or less regularly authorized companies, there were undoubtedly many vagabond companies which bore no name and whose performances it is impossible to trace.

The modern custom of sending an advance agent to the town to be visited several days before the coming of the company, to make the necessary arrangements for the visit, was not in vogue during the years 1550–1600; at least, I have been unable to find any record of such a custom. Even the great London Companies, when touring the country, seem to have given the town authorities no notice of their coming, and to have trusted to their good-will for permission to play and for a place to play in.

The first concern of a company upon arriving in a town was to obtain permission to play. Before 1572 any company of vagabonds could palm themselves off as a dramatic company, if they could succeed in hoodwinking the town authorities. But in that year a law was passed requiring that

all fencers, bearwards, common players in interludes, and minstrels, not belonging to any Baron of this realm, or to any other honorable personage of greater degree; all jugglers, pedlars, tinkers and petty chapmen, which said fencers, bearwards, common players in interludes, minstrels, etc., shall wander about, and not have license of two justices of the peace at the least, shall be deemed and dealt with as rogues and vagabonds.¹

Consequently, after 1572, when a company of players arrived in a town where they wanted to play, they at once presented their license to the civic authorities or satisfied them that they belonged to some "baron" or "honorable" person of the realm. Thus in the Leicester records for 1583 we find the following entry:²

Tuesday the third day of March, 1583, certain players
who said they were the servants of the Queen's Majesty's
Master of the Revels, who required license to play and for
their authority showed forth an Indenture of License from
one Mr. Edmund Tylney, Esquire, Master of her Majesty's
Revels, of the one part, and George Haysell of Wisbeach in
the Isle of Ely, in the County of Cambridge, gentleman, on
the other part.

¹ J. P. COLLIER, *The History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of Shakespeare; and Annals of the Stage to the Restoration* (1879), Vol. I, p. 195.

² Quotations and extracts have been modernized in spelling throughout.

The which Indenture is dated the 6th day of February in the 25th year of her Majesty's reign, etc. In which Indenture there is one article, that all Justices, Mayors, Sheriffs, Bailiffs, Constables, and all other her officers, Ministers, and Subjects whatsoever, to be aiding and assisting unto the said Edmund Tylney, his Deputies and Assignees, attending and having due regard unto such persons as shall disorderly intrude themselves into any the doings and actions before mentioned, not being reformed, qualified and bound to the orders prescribed by the said Edmund Tylney.¹ These shall be therefore not only to signify and give notice unto all and every her said Justices, etc., that none, of their own pretended authority intrude themselves and presume to show forth any such plays, interludes, tragedies, comedies, or shows in any places within this realm, without the orderly allowance thereof under the hand of the said Edmund.

Note. No play is to be played, but such as is allowed by the said Edmund, and his hand at the latter end of the said book they do play. The aforesaid Haysell is now the chief player, etc.²

A few days later the Earl of Worcester's Company arrived in Leicester, and the records give us a short summary of the license:

William, Earl of Worcester, etc., hath by his writing, dated the 14th of January, A° 25° Eliz. R° licensed his Servants, viz., Robt. Browne, James Tunstall, Edward Allen, Wm. Harryson, Tho. Cooke, Richard Johnes, Edward Browne, Richard Andrews to play and go abroad, using themselves orderly, etc. (in these words, etc.). These are therefore to require all such Her Highness' officers to whom these presents shall come quietly and friendly within your several precincts and corporations, to permit and suffer them to pass with your furtherance, using and demeaning themselves honestly and to give them (the rather for my sake) such entertainment as other noblemen's players have (In Witness, etc.).³

In 1597 a law was passed reviving the act of 1572 and requiring, in addition, that

the players of the nobility, wandering abroad, should be "authorized to play" under "the hand and seal of arms" of the Baron or personage of greater degree.⁴

¹ Edmund Tylney was master of Her Majesty's Revels from 1578 to 1610; cf. "Henslowe's Diary," ed. J. PAYNE COLLIER, *Publications of the Shakespear Society* (London, 1845), Introduction, p. xxix.

² WILLIAM KELLY, *op. cit.* (1865), pp. 211, 212.

³ KELLY, *op. cit.*, pp. 212, 213.

⁴ COLLIER, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 195, note.

The exemption of these two laws in favor of noblemen's servants was taken away by the act of 1603-4.¹

It seems to have been the custom in some towns for the players to give a first performance before the town authorities and those citizens who wished to attend, no admission being charged, but the players receiving a "reward" from the mayor. Thus Willis, in his *Mount Tabor*, 1639, describing the performance of the *Cradle of Security* seen by him when a boy, says:

In the city of Gloucester the manner is (as I think it is in other like corporations) that when Players of Enterludes come to town, they first attend the Mayor, to inform him what noble-man's servants they are, and so get license for their public playing: and if the Mayor like the actors, or would show respect to their Lord and Master, he appoints them to play their first play before himself and the aldermen and Common Council of the City; and that is called the Mayor's play, where everyone that will comes in without money, the Mayor giving the players a reward as he thinks fit, to show respect unto them.²

In the Bristol accounts for August, 1576, we find an entry which apparently refers to such a performance and gives ample evidence that these "free shows" were fully appreciated by the citizens:

Item, pd: for 2 rings of iron to be set upon the houses of the one side of the Guildhall door to rear the door from the ground and for mending the cramp of iron which shooteth the bar, which cramp was stretched with the press of people at the play of My Lord Chamberlain's servants in the Guildhall before Mr. Mayor and the Aldermen—6d.³

That this first performance before the mayor and aldermen was always free to the citizens, the players being satisfied with their reward, as Mr. W. Kelly states,⁴ and as Mr. E. K. Chambers seems to imply when he says referring to the players, "In the towns they would give their first performance before the municipality in the guild-hall and take a reward,"⁵ is highly improbable.

¹ E. K. CHAMBERS, *The Mediæval Stage* (Clarendon Press, 1903), Vol. I, p. 55, note.

² COLLIER, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 196.

³ J. F. NICHOLLS AND JOHN TAYLOR, *Bristol Past and Present* (Bristol and London, 1881), Vol. I, pp. 234, 235.

⁴ KELLY, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

⁵ *The Mediæval Stage*, Vol. II, p. 189. The evidence quoted above from Willis, *Mount Tabor*, and used by Mr. Chambers in proof of his assertion, refers not to the old amateur players of interludes, but to the professional "noble-man's servants."

In the town accounts we find frequent entries such as the following in the Leicester Records:

- 1555. Item. Pd. to the Queen's Players, over and above that was gathered—3s. 6d.
- 1559. Item. To the Queen's Players, beside the money that was gathered—3s. 6d.
- 1592. Item. The 19th of December, given to the Lord Admiral's Players, more than was gathered—8s.¹

Now, both the amount paid and the fact that there is only one such entry during the stay of the company in the town indicate that these rewards were given for a single performance, and most likely for the first performance before the mayor and council. If this is the case, it is obvious that an entrance fee was often charged at these first performances and the mayor's "reward" added to the amount collected for the benefit of the players. Very likely, as the visits of dramatic companies to the towns became more frequent, their credentials more reliable, and their plays and players better known, this "free" performance, which was at first the only way the authorities had of testing the merits of the plays and players, was done away with, and the mayor and aldermen attended, if at all officially, the first regular performance, the old custom of giving the players a "reward" out of the city coffers being continued. The fact that after 1550 the vast majority of entries in the town records of payments to companies of players are of "rewards" which have been added to the "money that was gathered" is almost conclusive proof of this.

Not only did the town authorities thus "show respect" unto the players, as Willis quaintly puts it, but often, if for some reason they refused to allow the company to play, they still gave them their "reward." Thus in the Leicester accounts we find the following entries:

- 1591. Item. Given to the Lord Dacre's Players in reward, which were not suffered to play—2s. 6d.
- Item. Given to the Earl of Worcester's Players in reward, for that they did not play—10s.²

Even after the system of licensing the companies was inaugu-

¹ KELLY, *op. cit.*, pp. 194, 227.

² *Ibid.*, p. 226.

rated, the 'town authorities were often imposed upon, and even defied, by the bands of players. In the Leicester Records there is an interesting account of a case of this kind. In the quotations from the records, we saw that on March 3, 1583, a company claiming to be the servants of the Queen's Majesty's Master of the Revels received permission to play in Leicester upon presenting an indenture of license from Edw. Tylney Esq., Master of Her Majesty's Revels, and George Haysell of Wisbeach, in the Isle of Ely, Gentleman (the chief player of the company).¹

Another entry, on March 6, states that—

Certain players came before Mr. Mayor at the Hall, there being present Mr. John Tata, Mr. George Tata, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Worship: who said they were the Earl of Worcester's men: who said the aforesaid players were not lawfully authorized, and that they² had taken from them their commission; but it is untrue, for they forgot their box at the Inn in Leicester, and so these men got it; and they said, the said Haysell was not here himself and they sent the same to Grantom to the said Haysell who dwelleth there.³

The entry then gives an abstract of the license presented by Worcester's men, and proceeds:

Mr. Mayor did give the aforesaid players an Angel towards their dinner and willed them not to play at this present: being friday the 6th of March, for that the time was not convenient.

The aforesaid players met Mr. Mayor in the street near Mr. Newcome's house, after the Angel was given about a 2 hours, who then craved license again to play at their Inn, and he told them they should not, then they went away and said they would play, whether he would or not, and in despite of him, with divers other evil and contemptuous words: Witness hereof Mr. Newcome, Mr. Wycam, and William Dethicke.

More, these men, contrary to Mr. Mayor's commandment, went with their drum and trumpets through the town, in contempt of Mr. Mayor, neither would come at his commandment, by his officer, viz: Worship

Wm. Pateson my lord Harbard's man
Tho. Powlton my lord of Worcester's man } these 2 were they which
did so much abuse Mr. Mayor in the aforesaid words.

Nota. These said players have submitted themselves and are sorry for these words past and craved pardon, desiring his worship not to write to their master again, and so upon their submission they are licensed to play this night at their inn; and also they have promised that upon the stage, in the beginning of their play, to show to the hearers that

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 82, 83.

² Worcester's men?

³ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

they are licensed to play by Mr. Mayor and his good will, and that they are sorry for the words past.¹

Not only were the players often in conflict with the civil authorities, but they also, at times, formed a bone of contention between the civil and spiritual powers. From the treasurer's accounts for the city of Edinburgh for November, 1599, it appears that a company of English players, of whom Laurence Fletcher was manager, obtained a warrant from the king to act in public. They accordingly proclaimed with drums and trumpets that they would act at a house in Blackfriar's Wynd in Edinburgh. The four sessions of the church promptly announced that anyone who attended the performance would be under the kirk's severest displeasure. The entry then states that, by His "Majesty's directions," Sir George Elphingstone delivered certain moneys to the players, and then continues:

Item. To the aforesaid messenger, passing with letters to the Mercat Croce of Edinburgh, charging the elders and deacons of the whole four sessions of Edinburgh to annul their act, made for the discharge of certain English Comedians. 10s. 8d.

The four sessions accordingly annulled their act against the players, and the ministers announced the fact from the pulpit.²

The players had their own methods of defying the hostility of the clergy. When in 1547 Bishop Gardiner announced that he would hold "a solemn dirge in honour of the late king at St. Mary Overyes," the players of Bankside issued the following proclamation: "They will act a solemn play to try who shall have most resort, they in game or he in earnest."³

That the players were often indiscreet in their treatment of the authorities is shown by the letter of Nicholson to Lord Burleigh on April 15, 1598, in which he says:

It is regretted that the Comedians of London should scorn the King and the people of this land in their play; and it is wished that the matter be speedily amended, lest the King and the country be stirred to anger.⁴

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 212-14.

² J. C. DIBBIN, *Annals of the Edinburgh Stage* (Edinburgh, 1888), p. 23.

³ WILLIAM RENDLE, *Old Southwark and its People* (Southwark, 1878), p. 215.

⁴ DIBBIN, *op. cit.*, p. 21; quoted from the *Calendar of State Papers Relating to Scotland*, II, p. 749.

The elders of the four sessions of Edinburgh made the same charge against the English Comedians as a partial justification of their refusing them the right to play in 1599.¹

In spite of occasional quarrels with the various powers that be, the regularly licensed companies of players were usually welcomed heartily by the authorities of the towns they visited. They were even highly honored at times, for in 1601 we find the members of a company of English players, called the "King's Servants," in Scotland, of whom Laurence Fletcher was chief actor and manager, receiving the freedom of the city while visiting Aberdeen.²

Having obtained permission to play, the next concern of the company was to notify the townsfolk of the time and place of the performance. Sometimes this was done by the town authorities, as in the case of Southampton, where we find the authorities issuing an order informing the townsfolk "that a famous company just arrived would play at convenient times."³ More often, however, the players themselves proclaimed with drum and trumpet the time and place of their entertainment.⁴

The places of performance varied from a private house or inn to the guild-hall or a regular playhouse. If the following entries refer to private houses, and not to inns, it seems probable that such performances were usually given on festive occasions. Thus in the Nottingham accounts for December 7, 1603, we read:

Richard Jackson committed for suffering players to sound their trumpets and playing in the house without license and for suffering his guests to be out all night.⁵

The expenses of such performances were probably borne by the owner of the house. Possibly the following entry in the same accounts for 1572 also refers to such a performance:

Item. Paid to Master Harpbam for ale, when the Queen's Players did play at his house—6d.⁶

¹ DIBBIN, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

² *Ibid.*, p. 24.

³ REV. J. S. DAVIES, *A History of Southampton* (Southampton and London, 1883), p. 217.

⁴ Cf. above, pp. 7, 8.

⁵ *Records of the Borough of Nottingham* (London, 1889), Vol. IV, p. 268.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 143. It is to be noted in connection with the two above entries that from 1550 on the inns were almost invariably designated by their sign, and not by their owner's name.

If so, it would apparently indicate that sometimes the town authorities paid for the ale or wine consumed by the players. It may be that in such cases the owner of the house was an alderman or some other municipal dignitary.

Again, in the Leicester accounts for 1571 we find the following entry:

Item. Pd: for wine that was given to Derby's men at Matthew Norris' wedding—6d.¹

In some of the towns the usual place for performances was the church—an obvious survival of the custom of the miracle- and interlude-players. In the Doncaster and Plymouth records such entries as the following are common:

1574, Aug. 2. To Lord of Leicester [’s men] for playing in the church—20s.²

1559-60. Lord Robert Dudley’s players for playing in the church—20s.³

So strong a hold had this custom taken in some places that in 1602 we find the town authorities of Syston in Leicestershire paying a company of players a “reward” on refusing them the privilege of playing in the church. The entry reads:

Paid to Lord Morden’s players because they should not play in the Church—xii d.⁴

In other towns, the town- or guild-hall was the customary place of performance. In the Oxford and Nottingham records we find such entries as the following:

Oxford: 1562, June 8. Given to my Lord of Warwick’s players when they played in the Guildhall—6s. 8d.⁵

Nottingham: 1577, August. Earl of Sussex (Men) at Town Hall—13s. 4d.⁶

Just as in the case of performances in the churches, when a

¹ KELLY, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

² JOHN TOMLINSON, *Doncaster from the Roman Occupation to the Present Time*, 1887, p. 47.

³ R. M. WORTH, *Calendar of the Plymouth Municipal Records* (Plymouth, 1893), p. 117.

⁴ KELLY, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁵ WILLIAM H. TURNER, *Selections from the Records of Oxford from Henry VIII. to Elizabeth* (1500-1583). By William H. Turner, (Oxford and London: Jas. Parker & Co., 1880) p. 299.

⁶ *Records of Nottingham*, Vol. IV, p. 168.

company was refused the right to use the town- or guild-hall, the town authorities considered it necessary to pay them a "reward." Thus in Leicester, 1586, we find this entry:

Item. Given to Earl of Essex players in Reward being not suffered to play at the Hall—20s.¹

When the players could not obtain the church or town-hall, they would resort to their inn or the inn-yard. Thus in the quotation above, on p. 7, when the Worcester Company was refused permission to play by the Leicester authorities, they said they would play at their inn whether the mayor wished or no. It does not seem likely, however, that the more important companies were often driven to this after 1550, as there are very few records of such being the case. Possibly the minor companies and mountebanks had more often to put up with such quarters, as in the following case at Leicester:

1590. Item. Given to certain players, playing upon ropes at the Cross Keys, more than was gathered—28s. 4d.²

In the same year, Worcester's, Hartford's, and the Queen's men played at the hall.

Sometimes when there was no suitable place available for the players to perform in, the authorities would prepare a place for them. Thus when the English players visited Edinburgh in 1599, we find the king ordering the "bailies" of the city to assist the players in preparing a place at his charges. This is the entry in the treasurer's accounts:

Item. By his Majesty's directions given to Sir George Elphingstone to be delivered to the English Comedians, to buy timber for the preparation of a house to their pastime as the said Sir George's ticket bears £40.³

The place chosen was Blackfriar's Wynd, not the historic playing-ground of Edinburgh, Greenside. The latter was made over to the Burgh of Edinburgh by James II., in 1456, for "tournaments, sports, and proper warlike deeds to be done and accomplished there for the pleasure of us and our successors."⁴ Plays and players soon took the place of tournaments and knights, and

¹ KELLY, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

² *Ibid.*, p. 224.

³ DIBBIN, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 8

in 1554 we find Sir David Lindsay's *Three Estates* being performed there. At this time there were several buildings on the playfield, as the following entry shows:

Item. Paid for making of the Queen's Grace's house on the playfield, beside the convoy house under the same, and the players' house, the gibbets and scaffold about the same, and boards on the playfield, carrying of them from the town to the field, and therefrom again, the cutting and inlaying of great and small timber, with the nails and workmanship of 6 wrights, two days thereto, pinners fees, cart hire and other necessities, as Sir William M'Dougall, master of work's ticket bears. £16. 5s. 4d.¹

Greenside was used for plays as late as 1588, for on "November 1, John Hill who was tenant of that land 'was discharged of any tilling and riving of any part of the playfield.'"²

Some such place for performance of plays existed in Shrewsbury in 1533, when plays were given in the "quarry outside the walls." Referring to this place in 1570, it is stated "that the places have been accustomed to be used." Here there were traces of a seated amphitheater as late as 1779.³ If players visited Shrewsbury from 1550 to 1600, they may possibly have used this place for their performances.

A few of the towns outside of London had regular playhouses, which were probably used for other purposes when no dramatic company was using them. Mr. E. K. Chambers found evidence of a playhouse in Exeter as early as 1348.⁴ In the town records of Great Yarmouth we find that—

after the Reformation the Corporation erected "a game house," and in 1538 when they granted a lease of these premises to Robert Copping they stipulated that he should "permit and suffer all such players and their audiences to have the pleasure and use of said house and game place, at all such times as any interlude or plays should be ministered or played at any time; without any profit thereof to his or his assigns to be taken."⁵

In Worcester in 1584 a lease of the "vacant place where

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9; quoted from town records.

² *Ibid.*, p. 18; quoted from town records.

³ *Books of Council Orders in Historical MSS*, Report XV, Appendix, Pt. X, p. 16, and in E. PHILLIPS, *History of Shrewsbury*, p. 201; quoted by E. K. CHAMBERS, *The Mediaeval Stage*, Vol. II, p. 394.

⁴ E. K. CHAMBERS, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 190.

⁵ CHAS. JOHN PALMER, *Perlustration of Great Yarmouth with Gorleston and Southtown* (Great Yarmouth, 1872), Vol. I, p. 351.

"pagants do stand" was granted for building, and there was a building known as the "Pageant House" as late as 1738. Whether or not this was used for plays does not appear.¹

Sometimes the players gave their entertainment in the evening, as in the case of the Worcester Company at Leicester in March, 1583,² though it seems probable that their usual time of performance was in the afternoon, as in London.

Sometimes, when traveling, the players were accompanied by a band of musicians. We come across such records as the following:

Nottingham: December 19, 1578—To Lord Haworth's players and musicians. 5s.³

Doncaster: 1578—Item. To My Lord Dacre's players and musicians. 13s. 4d.⁴

An entry in the Shrewsbury records may indicate that sometimes a company of players was accompanied by a band of musicians which regularly belonged to another company. It is as follows:

1591. Paid to L of Darby's musicians and Earl of Worcester's players. 22s. 8d.⁵

Of course, this may mean merely that these musicians and players performed separately and the payments to them were lumped together in one entry. But the amount, while large, does not seem an adequate reward for two separate performances of such famous companies, for in the same year such an insignificant company as Lord Beacham's was paid by the Shrewsbury authorities 13s. 4d.⁶ for one performance, and in 1590 Worcester's men received in Leicester, also for one performance, 20s.⁷

As many of the entries in the town records already quoted will have indicated, the players relied for remuneration for their services on two sources—the "gifts" or "rewards" granted them by

¹ Quoted by E. K. CHAMBERS, *loc. cit.*, p. 398.

² Cf. above, p. 7.

³ *Records of the Borough of Nottingham* (London, 1889), Vol. IV, p. 183.

⁴ JOHN TOMLINSON, *Doncaster from the Roman Occupation to the Present Time* (1887), p. 50.

⁵ OWEN AND BLAKENEY, *History of Shrewsbury* (Shrewsbury, 1825), Vol. I, p. 394.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 394.

⁷ KELLY, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

the town authorities or, in the case of Edinburgh, by the king, and the admission fee.

The relative amount of income derived from these two sources about 1590 can be estimated from an interesting entry in the Leicester records.¹ Under the date October 30, 1590, we find the following:

Receipts towards the charges of the Gifts given to Noblemen's Players:—

Imprimis. Received at the Hall door the 30th day of October, The Queen's Majesty's Players then playing—10s.

Item. Received at the Hall door, the Earl of Worcester's players then playing—6s. 8d.

Item. Received at the Hall door, the Earl of Hartford's players then playing—6s. 8d.

Item. Received of John Underwood, the Mayor's Sergeant, which was by him received of the Mayor's Brethren for 6 plays and one Bear Baiting—44s.

Item. Received more of the 48s., for the same plays and Bear Baiting—48s.

Total 5£, 15s, 4d.

Item. The 30th of October, given to the Queen's Majesty's Players, by the appointment of Mr. Mayor and his Brethren—40s.

Item. Given to the Earl of Worcester's Players, by the appointment of Mr. Mayor and his Brethren—20s.

Item. The 22nd of November, given to the Earl of Hartford's Players by the appointment, aforesaid—20s.

According to this account, which probably deals only with the first performances (if there were any others²), in which alone the city authorities seem to have been interested financially, the "rewards" or "gifts" given by them to the players are considerably greater than the receipts for admission. Thus, while the receipts at the hall door for the performance of the Queen's Company were only 10s., their "reward" out of the city purse was 30s., and in the case of Worcester's men 6s. 8d. at the door and 13s. 4d. from the city. The average amount taken at the door seems to have been about 7s., while the "gifts" from the city vary from 10s. to 40s. for the more important London Companies, the

¹ *Ibid.*

² Cf. below pp. 17, 18.

Queen's usually obtaining the greatest "reward." The Noblemen's and Town Companies had often to be satisfied with such small amounts as 2s. 6d., or 5s. for "rewards," with which amounts Lord Dacre's players are credited in 1591 and 1592.¹

Kelly supposes that the rewards of the various companies depended upon the rank of their patrons; the Queen's players receiving the highest reward; the companies of great noblemen, such as Worcester, Leicester, etc., receiving the next highest; then in the scale came the lesser noblemen's and great commoners' companies, and finally the Town Companies.² I have been unable to find any evidence in proof of the theory, except that those companies patronized by royalty and one or two of the more famous noblemen always received the greatest "rewards." Between the other companies the civic authorities do not seem to have distinguished.

On special occasions, such as May Day or Christmas, the Town Companies might receive a greater reward than usual, for in Plymouth in the years 1565-66, and 1566-67, we find such companies as the children of Totnes playing at Christmas, and the players of St. Burdock's playing on May Day, receiving 10s. reward.³

In Nottingham, Doncaster, Oxford, Shrewsbury, Bath, and Beverley the "rewards" given to players are about the same as in Plymouth and Leicester.

From 1550 to 1570 we find a steady rise in the "rewards" given to players by the town authorities. After 1570 the increase is not so marked, though there is still some noticeable.

As the visits of these itinerant companies became more frequent, the giving of rewards came to be a severe drain on the town coffers, and we are not surprised when we find the Leicester Corporation in 1566 making "an act against wasting of the town stock," in which it is set forth that—

Whereas before this time the town stock hath been and is much decayed by reason of giving, carrying, and bestowing of great gifts, as well in the country as in the town, to noble men and women, and also to others that have sundry times resorted to the said town of Leicester,

¹ KELLY, *op. cit.*, pp. 226, 227.

² *Ibid.*, p. 94.

³ R. N. WORTH, *Calendar of the Plymouth Municipal Records* (Plymouth, 1893), p. 120

and also at the banquets of venison, of gifts and rewards given to players, musicians, jesters, noblemen's bearwards, and such like charges; and is like daily to be more and more to be decayed, except reformation thereof be speedily had; therefore it is enacted, that from and after the said day there shall be no such great allowance paid, delivered, or allowed out of the town stock for any such expenses that shall happen, but that the spenders thereof, as at banquets of venison, plays, bear baitings, and such like, every one of the Mayor's brethren, and of the forty-eight, being required or having summons by the commandment of Mr. Mayor for the time being, to be there, shall bear everyone of them his and their portion.¹

It is also required that no "gift" should be given by the mayor without the consent of four or five of the "ancients" of his brethren, and as many of the ancients of the forty-five, except five shillings and under; which he could bestow for the "honor of the town" as often as he wished.

In November, 1581, the giving of rewards was further restricted by an act which stated:

It is agreed that from henceforth there shall not be any fees or rewards given by the chamber of this town, nor any of the twenty-four nor forty-eight to be charged with any payments for or towards any bearwards, bearbaitings, players, plays, interludes, or games, or any of them, except the Queen's Majesty's or the Lords of the Privy Council; nor that any players be suffered to play at the town hall (except as before excepted), and then but only before the Mayor and his brethren, upon pain of 40s. to be lost by the Mayor that shall suffer or do the contrary.²

These orders do not seem to have been very rigidly enforced, however, for we find the visits of companies and the payments of "rewards" to be about as frequent after as before their enactment.

We have already seen that the city sometimes gave presents of ale or wine to companies of players when playing at private houses on festive occasions.³ Occasionally they seem to have presented the companies with gifts of ale, wine, or even a contribution toward a meal in addition to the regular reward. Thus in Beverley, August 8, 1572, we find an entry in the town records of 9d. "for wine bestowed" on the Earl of Leicester's players in addition to

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 94, 95 (quoted).

² *Ibid.*, p. 95 (quoted).

³ Cf. above, pp. 9, 10.

their reward of 30s.¹ When Worcester's men visited Leicester in 1583, "Mr. Mayor did give the aforesaid players an angel towards their dinner."²

As we should expect, the receipts of the companies while traveling in the provincial towns were much smaller than their receipts while acting at the regular theaters in London. Malone supposed that during the early seventeenth century as much as £20 was often taken at the doors of the Globe and Blackfriar's Theaters for one performance, and we know that these theaters averaged about £9 clear profit on the benefit nights for the five and a half years after 1628.³ While the receipts at the older theaters, the Rose and Curtain, were probably smaller, still they must have been considerably more than the receipts in the provincial towns, for Henslowe as manager and part owner of these theaters from 1591-97 often pocketed daily as much as £3 or £4 as his share of the profits.⁴ Even supposing that he took more than his fifteen shares of the forty which was the proportion Malone supposed the proprietors to receive, the company getting twenty-two shares, still the profits must have been more than in the towns. In addition to this, we must remember that their traveling expenses must have been considerable while on the road, and that on many days while moving from one town to another, they could give no performances.⁵

How long a company would remain in a town, or how many performances it would give, I have been unable to determine, as the town records deal almost exclusively with the single performance in which the civic authorities were financially interested. That their stay was not long we may be fairly certain. Willis, in his reference to the customs of companies playing in Gloucester, implies that they gave more than one performance during their visit,⁶ and from the account of the quarrel between the town authorities and the so-called "Servants of the Queen's Majesty's

¹ GEORGE POULSON, *History and Antiquities of Beverley* (London, 1829), quoted from records, p. 319.

² Quoted from KELLY, *op. cit.*, above, p. 7.

³ COLLIER, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 233.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ It should be remembered that from 1550 to 1600 money had about eight times its present value.

⁶ Cf. as quoted above, pp. 5, 6.

Master of the Revels" and Worcester's men in Leicester in 1583, it appears that the former company did not stay in the town more than three days, for they arrived on Tuesday, March 3, and on March 6 appear to have left the city.¹

To be sure, in the Edinburgh accounts for October, November, and December, 1599, we find records of the performances of a company of English comedians, apparently the same company.² But whether their stay in Edinburgh was continuous during these months the entries do not allow us to determine. It is, however, probable that a company would stay a few days in a town, giving daily performances.

That some companies were more popular in certain towns than in others is evident from the frequency of their visits in those localities. Thus in Bath,³ the Lord Chamberlain's, afterward the Queen's Company, is by far the most frequent visitor, while in Beverley⁴ and Oxford⁵ the Earl of Leicester's men seem to have been the favorites.

Sometimes certain companies seem to have had a practical monopoly of the patronage of a town, at least for a certain length of time. Thus at Leicester in 1581 it was enacted that from that date only the players of the Queen and Lords of the Privy Council could act in that town.⁶

That the companies while traveling materially reduced the number of their actors does not seem probable, for in the Leicester records for 1583 we have the following list of Worcester's men given:

Robert Broune

Edward Broune

James Tunstall (Dunstan?)

Richard Andrews

Edward Allen

Thomas Powlton

William Harryson

William Pateson, Lord Har-

Thomas Cooke

bard's man.⁷

Richard Johnes

¹ Cf. as quoted above, pp. 7, 8.

² Cf. DIBBIN, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-24.

³ AUSTIN J. KING AND B. H. WATTS, *Municipal Records of Bath, 1189-1604* (London, 1885), p. 56.

⁴ GEORGE POULSON, *op. cit.*, pp. 294-319.

⁵ *Selections from Records of Oxford from Henry VIII-Elizabeth (1509-1582)* By WILLIAM H. TURNER, (Oxford and London: Jas. Parker & Co., 1880), pp. 267 *et seq.*

⁶ KELLY, *op. cit.*, cf. above, p. 16.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

Including Pateson, this gives a company of ten players, which was about the usual number carried by a company while acting in London, if we rule out persons taking unimportant parts in certain plays requiring a large cast. Undoubtedly a company while traveling would present only such plays as could be acted by an average number of players, and so do away with the expense of taking with them actors for unimportant parts.

In closing this paper, I wish to emphasize again the popularity of professional dramatic performances in England during the latter half of the sixteen century. There can be no doubt that that there were frequent quarrels between the town authorities and the traveling dramatic companies, and that among the more religious element of the citizens there was a feeling of opposition to dramatic performances as savoring of the devil; still such a statement as Mr. Courthope's in his *History of English Poetry* that "from the middle of the sixteenth century onwards the representation of stage plays, always encouraged by the nobility, had been *vehemently opposed* by the magistrate in almost every considerable city in England,"¹ can be nothing but misleading. The evidence he adduces to prove his statement is that "in 1572 the corporation of Leicester refused leave to the Earl of Worcester's players to act in the town."² Possibly this is true, though I have been unable to find the entry. Even so, the magistrates often had other reasons than religious ones³ for refusing to allow the players to perform. At any rate, we know that in 1572 Worcester's men did act in Leicester, for in the town records we find the following entry under that date:

Item. Given to the Lord of Worcester's Players, more than was gathered — 8s.⁴

Also from 1571 to 1576 we find records of the Queen's Players, the Players of Coventry, Lord Leicester's players, Lord Sussex' men, Lord Derby's Bearward and Essex' men, the players that came out of Wales, and Earl of Warwick's men, playing in that

¹ W. J. COURTHOPE, *History of English Poetry* (London, 1903), Vol. IV, p. 391.

² *Ibid.*

³ The context of the above quotation from Mr. Courthope implies that the magistrates of Leicester thus refused Worcester's men permission to play on religious grounds; cf. p. 391.

⁴ KELLY, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

town.¹ A reference to the town records of Nottingham, Oxford, Shrewsbury, Bristol, Doncaster, Beverley, Plymouth, Bath and Stratford-on-Avon shows frequent visits of dramatic companies. If the magistrates were so "vehemently opposed" to the "stage plays," it is remarkable that they so often should have not only allowed them to play, but attended the first performances, given the players "rewards" out of the city coffers, permitted them to act in the guild-hall or church, and even in some cases built play-houses for their performances; that in 1572 "John Hankey, Mayor of Chester would needs have the plays go forward against the wills of the Bishops of Canterbury, York, and Chester,"² and the plays were miracle plays at that. In fact, the state of the case seems to have been that the great body of English citizens, both magistrates and private citizens, were not only willing but glad to welcome the properly authorized dramatic companies to their towns and to attend their performances. Even the more Puritanical element did not so much object to the plays of the regular professional companies as to the miracle- and mystery-plays, and the popular amusements, such as the May games and Morris dances. The former they connected with the ritual of the Roman Catholic church, which they hated, and the latter with paganism. To assert, then, that, because a small and comparatively unimportant body of extremely strict Protestants and Roman Catholics loathed dramatic performances, the people of England were "vehemently opposed" to the stage, is both misleading and unjust.

Thus we have seen that during the latter half of the sixteenth century the professional actors superseded the old amateur players in the favor of the British public; that the professional companies, when traveling among the provincial towns, carried their usual number of players and, though not making such large profits as in London, managed to clear enough out of the admission fees they exacted, and the "gifts" or "rewards" of the corporations, to make their tours not unprofitable; that when in these towns they gave their plays at private houses, inns, inn-yards, churches, town- or guild-halls, and play- or game-houses where

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 204-6.

² E. K. CHAMBERS, *The Mediaeval Stage*, Vol. II, p. 353.

such existed, and that in those towns where the companies were accustomed to play in the church or town- or guild-hall they might even demand a "reward" if the town council refused to allow them to use these buildings for their performances; that in some towns one or two companies had a practical monopoly of the patronage of that town; and that, in spite of their occasional quarrels with the civil and spiritual authorities, these professional companies were popular with all but the extremely strict element of Protestant and Roman Catholic citizens of England.

JOHN TUCKER MURRAY.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

NOTE.—As the examination of the material connected with this subject is still going on with a view to the publication of a history of the dramatic companies, I wish it to be understood that the opinions expressed in this article are more or less tentative.

A
“Flo
quer
far t
much
and
(A.
the .
kind.
for th
and
“odd
scrip
scien
lore
direc
phosi
11)*
pera
mulie

¹ T
quæsti
Cologn
second
accurat

² F
English

³ K

⁵ D

⁶ W

zu Berl

⁷ T
topical
civitati

⁸ C

561]

RIDDLES OF THE BEDE TRADITION.

THE "FLORES" OF PSEUDO-BEDE.

AMONG the works doubtfully attributed to Bede, the so-called "Flores"¹ holds an interesting place. This varied assortment of queries falls roughly into three divisions. (1) The first, and by far the largest of these belongs to dialogue literature,² and has much in common with such well-known groups as the *Salomon and Saturn* (*S. & S.*)³ the *Altercatio Hadriani et Epicteti* (*A. H. E.*),⁴ the *Disputatio Pippini cum Albino* (*D. P. A.*),⁵ the *Joca Monachorum*,⁶ and the many other collections of like kind. These questions can hardly be regarded as riddles at all, for they are rather tests of knowledge than of the understanding and at all points display their clerical origin. They consist of "odd ends from Holy Writ" eking out by monkish additions to scriptural lore, scraps of proverbial philosophy, bits of pseudoscience, fragments of fable and allegory, gleanings from the folklore of the time.⁷ (2) The second class of problems consists of direct citation of famous Latin enigmas. Five riddles from Symphosius (1, 7, 4, 11, 10) and five from Aldhelm (I, 3, 10, 2, 4, 11)⁸ are quoted in full; and one from the latter (I, 10), "De puerpera geminos enixa," is prefaced with this paraphrase: "Vidi mulierem cum sex oculis, cum sexaginta digitis, cum tribus

¹ The full title of this *mélange* is *Excerptiones patrum, collectanea, flores ex diversis, quaestiones et parabolae*. Included in the Bâle edition of BEDE's *Opera* of 1563 and in the Cologne edition of 1612, the "Flores" was reprinted, partially and incorrectly, from the second in KEMBLE's *Salomon and Saturn* (1848), pp. 322-26, but appears in complete and accurate form in MIGNE's *Patrologia latina* (1850), 90, pp. 539 f.

² For an interesting summary of the material upon this subject see FÖRSTER, *Old English Miscellany* (Furnivall, 1901), pp. 86 f.

³ KEMBLE, *loc. cit.*

⁴ WILMANNS, *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum*, XIV, 530.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ WÖLFFLIN-TROLL, *Monatsberichte der königl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1872, p. 116.

⁷ The following query, with its strangely picturesque answer, has doubtless a local or topical reference: "Quaero barbarum quem inventire non possum. In aquilonari parte civitatis ubi aqua attingit parietem tolle saxum quadratum, ibi invenies barbarum."

⁸ Compare MANITIUS, *Zu Aldhelm und Baeda*, (Wien 1886), p. 82.

linguis, cum uno ore loquente."¹ (3) There remain a dozen riddles rich in popular motives and abounding in analogues. Some of these I have incidentally considered in an article upon the *Exeter Book Riddles* (*E. B. R.*),² but the group now demands a treatment more exhaustive than I was then able to offer.

TEXT.

(I) Die mihi, quaeso, quae est illa mulier quae innumeris filiis ubera porrigit, quae, quantum sucta fuerit, tantum inundat? Mulier ista est Sapientia.

(II) Vidi filium cum matre manducantem, cuius pellis pendebat in pariete.

(III) Sedeo super equum non natum, cuius matrem in manu teneo.

(IV) Dic mihi quae est illa res quae, cum augetur, minor erit: et dum minuitur, augmentum accipit.

(V) Dic mihi quae est illa res quae caelum totamque terram replevit, silvas et surculos confringit, omniaque fundamenta concutit: sed nec oculis videri aut manibus tangi potest.

(VI) Dic mihi unde fugit dies ante noctem et nox ubi currit et in quo loco uteisque requiescit. In sole requiescit dies et in nube nox.

(VII) Quid est quod mater me genuit et mox eadem gignetur a me?

(VIII) Vidi filium inter quatuor fontes nutritum: si vivus fuit, disruptus montes; si mortuus fuit, alligavit vivos.

(IX) Vidi bipedem super tripodem sedentem: cecidit bipes, corruit tripes.

(X) Vidi filium non natum sed ex tribus personis suscitatum et eum nutritum donec vivus vocaretur.

(XI) Vidi mortuum super vivum sedentem et ex visu mortui moriebatur vivus.

(XII) Vidi virginem flentem et murmurantem, viae ejus sunt semitiae vitae.

NOTES.

(I) This appears in the St. Gall MS No. 196, of the tenth century:³ "Quae est mulier, quae multis filiis ubera porrigit et quanto plus sugerint, tanto amplius redundabit?" See my association of our query with *E. B. R.*, XLII.⁴

¹ See my note on "Holme Riddles" No. 134 (MS Harl. 1960), *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XVIII (1903), p. 269.

² *Modern Language Notes*, XVIII., 97.

³ SCHENKL, *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Wien, 1863), XXXIV, p. 18.

⁴ *M. L. N.*, XVIII, 104.

(II) This has already been discussed by me as an analogue of *E. B. R.*, XIV,¹ and its place among popular riddles established. The "son" is evidently the hand, the "mother" the pen, and the "skin" the glove. This solution finds abundant support in two riddles of the St. Gall MS 196:² "Vidi hominem ambulantem cum matre sua et pellis ei pendebat in pariete;" and, "Vidi mulierem flentem et cum quinque filiis currentem cuius semita erat via et pergebat valde plana campestria." This second riddle, which is clearly a variant of "Flores," No. XII, points to the pen, the five fingers, and the leaves of parchment. The motive appears again in the Lorsch enigmas of English origin in MS Vaticana Palatinus, 1753 of the ninth century.³

En video subolem propria cum matre morantem
Mandre cuius pellis in pariete pendet adhaerens.

Ebert, in his discussion of this group of riddles,⁴ offers no solution of this, but Dümmler is misled by Eusebius, No. 38, "De Pullo," into suggesting "Ovum." In this connection note another interesting "Fingers" query in the "Joco-seria" of Pseudo-Bede, No. XIX (*infra*).

(III) My answer to this problem, "A horse drawn by a pen," puts it in the same class as No. II.

(IV) This finds its explanation in "Joco-seria," No. XVII, "Aetas hominis (*infra*)."

(V) The solution of this, "Ventus," is supplied by the author himself a few lines later, when he gives as the first victory of the wind, "Inflat et non videtur." He is undoubtedly indebted to the first line of Aldhelm, I, 3, "Cernere me nulli possunt nec prendere palmis," afterward quoted by him. Wilmanns points out⁵ the resemblance of this to the "Anima" query of the Munich *Interrogationes*,⁶ and the *Adrian and Epictetus*, No. 38,⁷ "Quid est quod tangitur et non videtur?" Another analogue is the

¹ *Loc. cit.*

² SCHENKEL, *loc. cit.*

³ DÜMMLER, *Poetae latini aevi Carolini* (Berlin, 1881), I, p. 20. These riddles are evidently countrymen and close kinsmen of those of Aldhelm and Eusebius, with which they are associated in the MS (*Zs. f. d. A.*, XXII, 258-61).

⁴ *Zs. f. d. A.*, XXIII, pp. 200-202.

⁵ *Ibid.*, XV, 169.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 167.

⁷ KEMBLE, *S. & S.*, p. 214.

"Wind" riddle of Vienna MS 67:¹ "Cernere me (nec) quisquam vinclis quoque (potest) neque tenere."

(VI) I have already pointed out the likeness of this to *E. B. R.*, XXX.² The relation of sun and moon, of day and night, is elsewhere in riddle literature a friendly one;³ indeed, in an Icelandic riddle,⁴ the two luminaries are a married pair. The association of night and a cloud is found in *D. P. A.*, 54; *A. H. E.*, 55.

(VII) This universal problem of "Ice" I have traced in detail.⁵ In addition to references already given, it is interesting to note that the riddle master of our collector, Aldhelm, cites this seeming *lusus naturae* in his *Epistola ad Acircium*.⁶

(VIII) The "Ox" motive seems the common property of all the riddle-groups of the Anglo-Saxon period.⁷ An elaborate form of the query not yet cited by me is found in the Lorsch collection, No. 11:⁸

Quando fui juvenis, bis binis fontibus haus:
Postquam consenui, montes vallesque de imis,
Sedibus evertens natura jura rescidi.
Post misero fato torpenti morte tabescens,
Mortuus horrende vivorum stringo lacertos.

(IX) This is the embryo of the universal riddle of "Two-legs and three-legs" discussed in my note to "Holme Riddles," No. 50.⁹

(IX) The explanation of this enigma seems to me to lie in the "Pullus" and "Ovum" problems of Symphosius, No. 14. ("Nondum natus eram, nec eram tum matris in alvo: Jam posito partu natum me nemo videbat"), Eusebius, No. 38; *D. P. A.*, No. 91, and MS Bern. 611, No. 5.¹⁰ The "three persons" of the riddle are, therefore, the cock, the hen who lays, and the hen who hatches the egg.

¹ MONE, *Anzeiger*, VIII (1839), 219, No. 42; RIESE, *Anthologia latina* (1870), I, ii, p. lxxii.

² M. L. N., XVIII, 104.

³ Compare Eusebius, No. 11; REUSNER, *Enigmatographia* (1602), I, 174, 200; II, 68; WOSSIDLO, *Mecklenburgische Volksüberlieferungen* (Wismar, 1897), No. 409; and see WÜNSCHE, *Kochs Zeitschrift*, IX, 499 f.

⁴ ÁRNASON, *Izlenzkar Gatur* (Copenhagen, 1887), No. 670.

⁵ M. L. N., XVIII, 4; *Publ. M. L. A.*, 1903, 246.

⁶ GILES, *S. Aldhelmi opera* (1844), p. 230; MANITIUS, *Zu Aldhelm und Baeda*, p. 52.

⁷ M. L. N., XVIII, 99.

⁸ DÜMMLER, *P. L. A. C.*, I, 22.

⁹ *Publ. M. L. A.*, 1903, 257, 258.

¹⁰ RIESE, *Anthologia latina*, I, 297.

(XI) This "Wick" ("Tallow and Flame") problem, appearing in *D. P. A.*, 89, is discussed by Wilmanns,¹ who cites our reference and a modern analogue from the *Strassburger Ratselbuch*, No. 198. I find the query, in like form in MS St. Gall. 196;² and similar contrast-motives are not uncommon in recent riddle literature.³

(XII) This query has been explained under No. II (*supra*). "Viae ejus sunt semitae vitae" can refer only to the holy words traced by the pen. Compare the close of Aldhelm's octostich, V, 3, "De Penna Scriptoria":⁴

Nec satis est unum per campos pandere callem:
Semita quin potius mileno tramite tendit,
Quae non errantes ad caeli culmina vexit.

Note, too, the gloss to "Joco-seria," No. XIX, 2 (*infra*).

"JOCO-SERIA" OF PSEUDO-BEDE.

The Cambridge MS Gg V 35 is described in the catalogue⁵ as "a quarto of 454 leaves, in a handwriting not earlier than the eleventh century, once belonging to the monastery of St. Augustine, Canterbury." For the date a *terminus a quo* is established by the presence, near the close of the MS, of certain German lyrics evidently composed during the reign of Emperor Henry III (1039-55).

Valuable for many reasons, this codex is of prime importance to the student of Latin enigmas. Among its contents are the riddle-groups of Symphosius, Boniface, Aldhelm, Tatwine, and Eusebius. The last three have been printed by Giles;⁶ those of Boniface, by Dümmler.⁷ On very good grounds, Giles ("Preface") assigns the MS to the time of the Norman Conquest;⁸ and in this opinion he seems to be sustained by so high

¹ *Zs. f. d. A.*, XIV, 552.

² SCHENKL, *loc. cit.*

³ WOSSIDLO, Nos. 78, 677; PETSCH, *Palaestra*, IV (1899), p. 138.

⁴ GILES, *loc. cit.*, p. 281.

⁵ Catalogue of MSS of the Library of the University of Cambridge (1858), Vol. III, p. 201.

⁶ *Anecdota Bedae, Lanfranci et Aliorum*, Caxton Society, VII, 1851.

⁷ *Poetae latini aevi Carolini*, I, p. 3.

⁸ The conclusions of Giles are accepted by EBERT, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königl. sächs. Gesellsch. der Wiss. zu Leipzig*, XXIX (phil.-hist. Cl., 1878), p. 29. A like view is held by Mr. Jenkinson, who kindly discussed the MS with me at Cambridge, July, 1903.

an authority as Felix Liebermann, who collated the Boniface text for the Dümmler edition.

Two leaves of the MS (fol. 418b, 419a) contain "Enigmata" attributed to Bede in the table of contents. On how strong a tradition this ascription of authorship rests it is, of course, impossible to determine; but perhaps its explanation lies in the immediate precedence of the enigmas by Bede's well-known "Versus de Die Judicii"¹ (fol. 416a).

The "Joco-seria," nineteen in all, are copiously glossed in what seems to me to be a different hand of the same period. I now take occasion to publish text and gloss, not because the queries themselves are of first-rate importance, but because the interlinear commentary is unique among glosses in casting a powerful light upon the peculiar esteem in which art-riddles were held in the Anglo-Saxon time.

Of our nineteen enigmas a dozen may be classed as logographs,² a form of word-riddle very popular in the later Middle Ages and occasionally furnishing diversion before the Conquest. The ubiquitous³ "Castanea" logograph appears in the Lorsch collection,⁴ No. VII; the hardly less known problem of "Paries"⁵ is employed by Aldhelm (V, 8, l. 8); and similar word-problems diverted the leisure moments of Alcuin.⁶ The essential unlikeness of the enigmas of the Cambridge MS to those that we meet elsewhere proclaims their author's originality as truly as the inadequate diction, awkward syntax, incorrect grammar, and halting meter attest his literary limitations. Enigmas, Nos. V ("Amor") and VIII ("Apes") employ, it is true, puzzle-words, frequently appearing in riddle literature,⁷ but in very different fashion. No. IX is built upon the Letter I, like the thirty-ninth enigma of Eusebius, but the single line of our problem certainly

¹ GILES, *Bede's Opera*, I, 99 f.

² "Der Logogryphe besteht darin, dass man von einem Worte die Buchstaben auf verschiedene beliebige Weise versetzt und dadurch andere Wörter bildet" (FRIEDREICH, *Geschichte des Rätsels* [Dresden, 1860], p. 20). Compare OHLERT, *Rätsel und gesellschaftsspiele der alten Griechen* (Berlin, 1886), p. 180.

³ M. L. N., XVIII, 7, note.

⁴ DÜMMLER, P. L. A. C. I, 22.

⁵ M. L. N., loc. cit.

⁶ DÜMMLER, I, 281, 282; M. P. L., 101, 802.

⁷ "Amor" ("Roma") is found not only in an unpublished English MS of the fourteenth century, Arundel, 248, fol. 9b, but in several of the continental MSS cited by Mone (*Anz.*, VII, pp. 48, 47, Nos. 73, 123). "Dapes" I have already traced (M. L. N., loc. cit.).

owes nothing to the earlier enigma. The possibilities of "Navis" (No. XIII) as a logograph, so well recognized by monkish riddlers,¹ are entirely overlooked in this tame riddle; and No. VII "Aetas Hominis," which I have associated (*supra*) with "Flores," No. IV, is but a riddle-germ. The "Digiti" query (No. XIX), as we have already seen in considering "Flores," No. XII, contains, in its second line, a motive not dissimilar to one used in older "Finger" enigmas, but the explanation of this resemblance probably lies in coincidence of fancy. To the remaining riddles I find not even remote analogues.

Yet these enigmas are merely the least part of themselves. The author is not so important as the glossator: the text is quite overshadowed by the commentary of Baruch. While the queries, as I have said, occupy no high place in riddle literature, the glosses are of peculiar value in illustrating, as nothing else could do, the attitude of the monkish audience of the early enigmato-graphs. After the manner of his kind the commentator takes his pleasure very sadly: every line, indeed every word, of his author, must be weighed as gravely as the phrases of Scripture or the rubrics of liturgy. As we follow him from his patient exposition of the metrical considerations involved in the key-words to the two opening problems, through his unnecessary restatement of much that is obvious in the logographs (see No. VIII, "Apes"), to his elaborate exegesis of the hidden meanings of the final enigma, we are brought to comprehend the ready welcome accorded by pedantic leisure to the serio-comic products of pedantic scholarship and to understand the continued vogue of these in the cloisters of England. By the mediæval reader queries which so often seem to us drearily dull and flat were evidently deemed miracles of ingenuity, inviting and repaying his utmost subtlety.

In one respect, however, the interpreter of our enigmas commands applause. He is clearly master of his subject, and his solutions, unlike so many of those fastened by modern scholarship upon early riddles, have the not small merit of really solving the problems to which they are attached. In the one riddle (No.

¹ MONE, *Anz.*, VII, p. 48, Nos. 128, 132.

VIII, "the dweller in the deep, which feeds a numerous people,") in which the commentator has failed to state definitely his answer, we are left in every sense at sea. For obvious reasons, "Balaena," in riddle literature, is rather the eater than the eaten.¹

One of the smaller cetaceans—perhaps the dolphin, whose flesh is edible—may be intended.

TEXT.

[418b]

- (I) (1) Nil herebo melius celo sic peius habetur.
- (2) Ulius aut potius quamquam pretio caret est quid.
(*Gloss.*)
- (1) Melius nihil quam herebus i. infernus vii tempora habet.
inferno (over "herebo").—peius est nihil habere quam celum tria tempora.
- (2) Celum non habet pretium pro quantitate balnitatis eius nec infernus pro quantitate malitie.—melius (over "potius"). celum et infernus (over "caret est").
- (II) (1) Bis titiucilium plumbum numerat trutinando.
- (2) Ter sese cedit prope peiori meliusque.
- (3) Plus (h)oneris hoc est quod jam minus aggrauat oream.
(*Gloss.*)
- (1) r. pro sillaba non pro pondus—plumbum dissillabum est et magnum pondus habet—titiucilium est exasillabum et leuissimum constat.
- (2) locum dat (over "cedit"). titiucilio (over "peiori"). ideo quia titiucilium habet vii tempora et plumbum iv (repeated)—titiucilium si in statera amittitur parum ulde trahit, plumbum multum pensat, tam plures sillabas et tempora habet quam plumbum. (On margin) melius peiori cedit, i: locum dat.
- (3) majoris ponderis (over "plus honeris"). onerat (over "aggrauat"). lanceam uel stateram (over "oream").
- (III) Littera que mutata saporem mutat acerbum.
(*Gloss.*)
(On margin twice) Acerbum saporem habet; muta f. in m. et mutabis saporem quia erit mel.

F. M. Mel.

- (IV) Que sensum vertit monosyllaba grammata servans?
(*Gloss.*)
os—monosyllaba est siue signifies os—oris aut os—ossis et non mutat litteraturam in nominativo sed sensum.

Os.

¹Cf. MS Reims 743, MONE, *Anz.*, VII, p. 44, No. 82. "Piscis ero per quem vivens homo saepe voratur."

(V) Uel que pars urbem dissillaba uersa patrabit?
 (Gloss.)
 amor dissillabus est—uerte sillabas et fiet Roma. faciet (over
 “patrabit”).
 Amor.

(VI) Nemo supinum non amat omnipotens nec amantes.
 (Gloss.)
 Uerte has sillabas et fiet omen, i. augurium—omnipresens deus
 non amat augurium nec obseruantes.
 Nemo = Omen.

(VII) Quid dat hac illaque meanti pabula panis?
 (Gloss.)
 Muta sillabam, semper seges erit—ideo datur meanti hac et illac.
 Seges.

(VIII) Gramma pedem sine sanguine quod tollit copulatum.
 (Gloss.)
 (On outer margin) ideo littera copula pedis et tollis pedem sine
 sanguine.
 (Over line) si littera a preponit pedi erit apes—i. sine pede et
 declinat apes-apedis et sine concione.
 (On inner margin) tollit pedem cum datur apes—absque ped.
 Apes-apedis—sine pede et inde apes datur quia sine pede.
 Apes.

(IX) Que res sola est recta sodalibus uncis?
 (Gloss.)
 I littera sola recta est in alphabetis.

(X) Littera queque culum facit ut uideat uelut oc[u]lus?
 (Gloss.)
 Et que culus—ani dorsi que minime uidet, antepone o littera et
 uidebit ut oc[u]lus utpote quia erit oculus.
 O.

(XI) Si bonus amittit caput admittens onus artat.
 (Gloss.)
 Si tollis b. litera fiet bonus, statim grauat. perdit (over “amit-
 tit”). grauat uel stringit uel aliter (over “artat”).
 Bonus.

(XII) Peruversus bonus est, leuitati si caput absit.
 (Gloss.)
 Quisquis peruversus est ex levitate mentis est, tolle primam sil-
 labam que caput est eius i. per et sit uersus i. bonus.
 Peruversus.

(XIII) Quid capite et cauda sicca ineat in mare natans?
 (Gloss.)
 nauis prora et puppis sicce erunt quando mare innatant. sieco
 (over “et”).
 Nauis.

(XIV) (1) Tres proles nantes iuncte genuere sorores:
 (2) Rursus easdem he mature post pepererunt.
 (3) Manducasse nocent somno prosunt bene mensa.
(Gloss.)

(1) Ista est constructio—tres iunctae sorores i. tres litterae o. u. a. genuere nantes proles i. tres pullos et iterum maturi pulli genuere easdem scilicet litteras o. u. a. que iuncta ova exprimunt.
 (2) Sorores i.—o. u. a., oua sana postea.
 (3) Si quem somniat manducasse oua dum euiglauerit, intelliget non esse somnium bonum.
 [419a.] O. u. a.

(XV) (1) Uidi in celo cornutam petisse uolantem,
 (2) Quam minimum peteret si non hanc ipse iuuaret.
(Gloss.)

(1) Cornigerata(m) catapulta uolantem in aere auem appetit, que minime posset attingere, si ipsa catapulta suis pennis subleuaret ante. in aere (over “in celo”). catapultam (over “cornutam”). appetisse (over “petisse”). auem (over “uolantem”).
 (2) si pennata catapulta non fuerit, non potest longi iaci f. uolantem (over “minimum”). attingeret (over “peteret”). cornutam (over “iuuaret”).

(XVI) Quid iugiter cedit, cum cessauerit (MS, sruerit) omen habebit?
(Gloss.)
 Semper mare accedit et recedit, quando cessauerit in die iudicii magnum portentum erit. percutit (over “cedit”). cessauerit (over “sruerit”). signum (over “omen”).

(XVII) Quid, quanto crescit mage, curtior extat?
(Gloss.)
 Aetas hominis quanto magis crescit uicinior erit morti. defec-tior per senium (over “curtior extat”).

(XVIII) (1) Quis nolens hospes maris illustrat tenebrosa?
 (2) A nullo pastus pascit pop[u]lum numerosum:
 (3) Unius arte hominis perit et non fauce ualebit;
 (4) Una namque die, nunquam consumptus abibit.
(Gloss.)

(1) Occisus certe magnum praebet sagine augmentum lichnis(?) et nolens quia iniuitus moritur.
 (2) a nullo pop[u]lo pascit[ur] et tamen multitudinem pop[u]li satiat suis carnibus.
 (3) unus homo potest eum decipere sed non unus potest eum deuorare.

(4) nunquam abibit, i. consumetur in una die. consumetur uel
recedet (over "abibit").

(XIX) (1) Tres gemini repunt stimulati marmore pellis:

(2) Hac illaque uias geminas monstrant uagitando,

(3) Atque docent muti fantes cecique uidentes.

(4) Sepe mouentem se fallunt quod it (MS, id) haud ubi mandant:

(5) A se sepe etiam falluntur torta colendo.

(*Glossa*).

(1) Tres digiti discurrunt in pagina stimulati i. cum acuta
penna uel graphio uel planitie. stimulis armati (over "sti-
mulati"). uel campi (after "pellis").

(2) discurrendo hue et illuc duas uias ostendunt i. bonam et
malam quia tam bene scribunt uias sequendas quam uitandas.

(3) et ipsi muti digiti loquentes et sunt ceci et ostendunt uiam
uidentibus. docent (over "cecique uidentes").

(4) (Over line) sepe decipiunt scriptorem quia scribunt quae
non debent et non seruant quod scribunt. scriptorem (over
"mouentem"). decipiunt (over "fallunt"). quia uadit non
(over "quod id haud").

(On outer margin) cum digiti scribunt que sancta sunt et
scriptor non seruat que scribit, tunc decipit quia non uadit
uiam quam docet scribendo.

(5) sepe seipso decipiunt ut puta moneta, quia falsum numisma
sculpit et pro hoc amputantur ei manus.

"PROPOSITIONES AD ACUENDOS JUVENES"

The "Propositiones ad Acuendos Juvenes," which are number problems rather than riddles, appeared in the Bale edition of Bede, 1563 (p. 133), and, under protest, are included in his works in the *Patrologia latina*.¹ They are not mentioned by Bede in his enumeration of his writings; and Alcuin's editor in the *Patrologia*² finds two good reasons for ascribing them to that scholar. They are assigned to him in at least one old MS, and are specifically mentioned by him in a letter to Charlemagne (Epistle 101): "aliquas figuræ arithmeticae subtilitatis laetitiae causa." These number-puzzles were for a long time popular. I find Alcuin's fifty-three "Propositiones," under our rubric in MS Burney 59 (eleventh century), fol. 7b-11a, and many similar arithmetical riddles in MS Cott. Cleopatra B. IX (fourteenth cen-

¹ M. P. L., 90, 655.

² Ibid., 101, 1143.

tury), fol. 17b-21a. Alcuin's river-crossing problem (No. XVIII), "De homine et capra et lupo," is found, somewhat modified, in later English and continental MSS.³

³ MS Sloane 1489 (seventeenth century), fol. 16, unpublished; MS Reims 743 (fourteenth century), Mone, *Anz.*, VII, p. 45, No. 105; MS Argentoratensis, Sem. c. 14, 15 (eleventh century), fol. 176, *Zs. f. d. A.*, XVI, p. 323.

FREDERICK TUPPER, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

THE STUDY OF FOLK-SONG IN AMERICA.

WITH the completion of the late Professor Child's monumental collection of *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*—a definitive edition, if anything of the sort can be definitive—it has seemed to many that the final returns had been gathered and the subject practically closed. But an inevitable result of the work of a great scholar is that it originates a long line of subsequent investigation. Professor Child's collection was practically definitive for certain purposes. It is the aim of this paper to suggest the importance of supplementary research for the satisfaction of certain other interests, as well as a method by which that research can be carried on.

The traditional ballad still persists in America, and to an extent undreamed of by many. At the University of Missouri, during the past year or two, the attempt has been made to record and classify such material as could be gathered from the lips of the people by students and instructors. The results have been interesting and gratifying. The body of American university students, especially of students in the state universities, is a body representative of all classes of American society. Is it not worth while to attempt a systematic search for old and vanishing folk-song in America, to be carried on by the students and under the direction of the teachers of our schools, colleges, and universities?

The Missouri collection, imperfect as it is, will give an idea of the results that may be looked for from such an investigation. Though contributions of a piece or two each have been made by many, the collection is in the main the work of four persons, each representing a different locality. In a year and a half versions have been found of eleven of the British ballads recorded in Professor Child's volumes. Some of these are not represented by American versions in Child's collection, and the others differ in various interesting ways from the American versions recorded by him. Five forms of "Barbara Allen" have come in. Of "The Demon Lover"—of which Child mentions, but failed to

recover, an early American broadside, printing only two stanzas, and those from an old Philadelphia magazine—we have two complete versions, both nearer to the British form than is Child's fragment. And all these representatives of old English balladry are known and have been preserved orally; though this is not to say that they are unknown here in print. The finding of eleven out of three hundred and five ballads, and most of those already recorded in American versions, is, to be sure, no great matter in itself; but, taken in conjunction with what Mr. Newell and Mr. Barry have printed in the *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, it partly indicates the extent to which the old ballads have been preserved in this country. The finding of recognized ballads inherited from the old country is not, however, the only, nor indeed the most interesting, result of our efforts. The existence as authorless popular song of pieces that clearly go back to the Old World and to former centuries, but have not found place in collections; the formation of new ballads out of old ones by "degeneration;" the continuance of the ballad-making faculty among Americans, evidenced not only by pieces relating to the War of 1812, the fight for Texas, the Mexican War, the Argonauts of 1849, and the Civil War, but also by such ballads of homely tragedy as "Young Charlotte," "Fuller and Warren," and "McAfee's Confession," and such archaic rimed homilies as that which I have called "The Wicked Girl"—all these things are shown by what a few students have brought together here in a few months.

What has been done in Missouri is mentioned only for the light it throws on what may be expected from widespread organized research. With the interest of students aroused and directed by competent scholars throughout the Union and Canada, it is not too much to hope that in a few years—half a score at most—practically every vestige of the *English and Scottish Popular Ballads* in America will be found and reduced to writing. What in the great work of Professor Child, in the gatherings of Mr. Newell and Mr. Barry, and in our Missouri collection appears sporadic and merely curious will then be seen completed—and related. With organized research, employing the services of

students from the communities, and even from the very homes, where the old ballads still live, it will soon be possible to tell not only what ballads have survived in America, but how they have survived—what changes they have undergone, how widely they are known, and what the course and manner of their transmission have been. Take, for example, "The House Carpenter" (i. e., "The Demon Lover"). Mr. Barry has found the American broadside of this, printed in New York apparently in the first half of the last century. Professor Child¹ printed two stanzas of this version from *Graham's Magazine* for September, 1858 (having failed to find the broadside, though he knew of its existence). Now, there are in our Missouri collection two copies of this ballad from oral tradition. They are probably similar to the broadside (of which I have seen only the two stanzas printed by Child), but are certainly by no means identical with it.² What, then, has been the history of "The House Carpenter" in America? Did some enterprising English printer introduce it in the early broadside, and are the Missouri versions, and all other versions in America, descendants of that single print? Or does the New York print mean that the piece was already familiar in America, and that the Missouri versions are probably independent of it? At present we can only guess at the answer. But when we know accurately in what parts of the country, in what variety of forms, and with what traditions of its source the piece has been preserved; when, by comparison of the ascertainable history of this with that of other pieces, we are clear as to the typical course or courses of transmission of English ballads in America—then such questions can be answered with some confidence. The only sure means of getting the needed information is co-operative organized research.

¹ Vol. IV, p. 361.

² Compare with the first of the stanzas printed by Child the corresponding second stanza of Missouri A:

" If you have returned from the salt briny sea
I'm sure you are to blame,
For I have married a house carpenter,
And I'm sure he's a nice young man."

Observe that the "king's daughter" has disappeared entirely. Moreover, the story is not Americanized in the Missouri version as it is in the broadside. The destination of the lovers is not the banks of the Tennessee, but of "the sweet Willee." In British versions it is "Italy."

Those who hold the doctrine (more or less modified) of the "communal origin" of ballads are inclined to deny the existence of native American balladry, at least in any proper sense of the word. Ballad-making, says Professor Gummere, is "a closed account." But whatever may be one's theory of ballad formation there is already evidence, which organized research would unquestionably fill out to demonstration, of the existence in America of truly popular ballads, widely known in the land, with no more personal authorship in the minds of those that sing them than "Hickory Dickory Dock," and yet with internal evidence of an American origin. Such is "Springfield Mountain," of which Mr. Newell published a number of versions, from different states, in Vol. XIII of the *Journal of American Folk-Lore*. Another is "Young Charlotte," well known in Missouri, reported by Professor Lewis, of Chicago, as known to him in childhood (though by another name) in New Jersey, found (a fragment) by Mr. Barry in Maine, and recently communicated to me from Wisconsin. It may very likely go back to print; it may go back to a strictly personal authorship in the brain of some humble poet, but as it is known to those who sing it now it is as purely impersonal and traditional as "The House Carpenter" or "Thomas and Eleanor." And there are others in the Missouri collection that are unquestionably American in the minds of those who sing them, and just as unquestionably employ the formulas, and sometimes the typical incidents, of Old World balladry. What is the origin and what has been the history of these? What part has print played in their spread and perpetuation? These are questions that well-directed organized research should enable us to answer.

The serious eagerness of the folk-song enthusiast over the very humble material with which he busies himself sometimes calls forth a quizzical smile on the faces of his friends. In American folk-song it must be confessed that the poetic quality of "Sir Patrick Spens" or "Kempion" will for the most part be sought in vain. The study must justify itself, where justification is called for, on other grounds, and chiefly on these two; that it leads to a knowledge of the simplest elements of literary taste, and that it contributes directly to the history of civilization, to a

knowledge of social and ethical conditions, among the people where the songs are found. Sometimes these songs have a good deal of local interest by reason of specific incidents embalmed in them, but the general and final value, the wide significance that underlies the study and justifies it to culture is the light it sheds on problems of taste and of social history. If, as has been supposed, ballads both British and American are found chiefly in such communities as those of the Kentucky and Tennessee mountains, we shall draw certain inferences from that fact. If, as I incline to believe, ballads are much more evenly distributed over the United States, are nearly as frequent in the New England, middle and north central states as in the southern mountains, we shall revise our notions of the culture-media of ballads—or, perhaps of the original social character of different parts of the Union—accordingly. But we cannot expect satisfactory results from partial, isolated investigation. From whatever point of view we approach the study—that of our inheritance from the Old World, that of ballad origins, that of literary taste or of social history—our research, if it is to give a basis for reliable inference, must be systematic and practically exhaustive. If the work of collection is taken up by college students under the direction of scholars in all parts of the country, a classified body of material can in a few years be got together that will lead to reasonable certainty on many points that are now mere matter of conjecture.

Having thus attempted to set forth the results to be expected from systematic co-operation in the study of popular poetry, it remains only for me to give in outline the method I have in mind. The reason for suggesting the plan here is merely the hope that it may elicit further suggestions, may bring those interested in touch with one another, and so prepare the way for an effective organization at an early date.

I. In many of our colleges and in most of our universities there is, among the teachers, at least one who knows and cares something about folk-song. Among the students there are probably several who have direct knowledge of some traditional folk-song, and access to much more. The problem is to arouse

the interest of these students and bring their knowledge within reach of the seeking scholar. The study of ballads in literature classes may accomplish it. A public lecture on balladry, with some account of the eighteenth-century ballad revival and its significance in literary history, might, by the introduction of some of the American versions already recorded, be the electric spark to complete the circuit. At the University of Missouri the investigation was set on foot, as indeed it has been carried on, by the English Club, a student organization that has a good deal of local patriotism. By these or other means the first step is to arouse interest among the students who have access to the sources. Once aroused, it will probably soon spread to others besides the students. The work will involve some labor of correspondence.

II. Inclusion rather than exclusion should be the rule in the work of collection. Until the matter is in your hand, sometimes even then, you do not know whether it is worth anything or not. One of our most efficient collectors was inclined to apologize for sending a version of "The Jew's Garden" (i. e., "Sir Hugh"), thinking that it was merely a "funny" piece; and I myself failed to recognize in "Black Jack Daley," when it first came to hand, the "Gypsy Laddie" of Child's collection. It is easy to disregard what is worthless after you have it, but if you reject or discourage on hearsay you never know what you may have lost. Printed matter is by no means to be refused; both because the investigation is ideally a study of popular taste, in which print certainly plays nowadays a most important rôle, and because the relation of print to oral tradition is precisely one of the chief problems to be solved.

III. An essential point, of course, is that the circumstances under which any piece is found shall be recorded. Yet this is difficult to enforce. Many people that know and enjoy folk-song are shy about acknowledging the fact to strangers, or at least reluctant to have their names and antecedents set down on paper. Others do not understand the need of authentication; still others are careless. It is here particularly that the services of the directing scholar are needed. My practice is to ask contributors to give with each contribution answers to these questions:

1. Have you given it just as you found it—mistakes, meaningless words, and all?
2. Where, when, and from whom did you get it?
3. Did you take it down from singing, or from recitation, or copy it from MS?
4. Where, when, and under what circumstances did your informant learn it?
5. What do you know of the antecedents (racial stock, location, etc.) of your informant?
6. Does your informant know of the piece in print?

It is well to assure the contributor that no improper or inconsiderate use will be made of the information desired.

The director of the work will no doubt classify tentatively as his matter comes in, and will soon find what kind of folk-song has most thriven in his territory; but he will do well to destroy nothing until he has compared his results with those secured at other places.

The organization for this final comparison, recording and perhaps publishing of results, though essential to the scheme, need not be discussed at present. If the method thus far outlined meets with approval and adoption the last step in the organization will not be difficult. Inasmuch as the idea was first suggested at a meeting of the Modern Language Association,¹ and has as its essential feature the co-operation of college teachers throughout the land; inasmuch, also, as the constitution of the association provides for the appointment of special committees when occasion arises, it would seem that no new association would be needed to carry out the work. But it will be time enough to consider this when the work is fairly begun in the local centers, the schools, colleges and universities of America.

HENRY MARVIN BELDEN.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

¹ In a paper on "Folk-Song in Missouri," read by the present writer at the recent meeting of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association, in Chicago.



SOME PRINCIPLES OF ELIZABETHAN STAGING.¹

PART I.

THERE is perhaps no subject connected with Shakespeare on which there is more uncertainty of opinion than on the actual staging of his plays. No one any longer doubts that the public stage consisted of three important parts: a front, uninclosed platform; a rear stage, separated from the front by a curtain; and a balcony or upper stage. A growing feeling exists also that the stage was fairly well-furnished with properties. But the exact relation of one part to another, the precise list of furnishings, and, more important than either of these, the actual customs and methods of play-production, yet remain to be determined. Given such a triple stage, how were plays performed which consisted of a large number of short, rapidly changing scenes, and which demanded, and often were clearly furnished with, numerous and sometimes heavy properties? They could not have been staged according to modern methods, with a complete and harmonious background for each scene. What, then, was the method or methods by which these plays were produced?

Practically but one answer has been given—that of Kilian,

¹This study is only part of a more comprehensive one now in preparation, discussing not only the staging of the Elizabethan plays, but also the actual construction of the stage itself and the properties which furnished it. Most of the opinions advanced here were formulated three years ago, but the publication of BRODMELER's *Die Shakespeare Bühne* in 1904 has made necessary the reconsideration of the alternation theory in the more reasonable form in which he presents it. I have attempted, however, neither to answer nor to review his valuable contribution, leaving many interesting points in his dissertation quite unnoticed.

The two pictures of theater interiors reproduced are from photographs of the originals in the British Museum. The Roxana picture has been many times reprinted, but not, I believe, with the whole title-page. The Messallina picture has never before been published, and seems practically unknown to writers upon the stage. My attention was called to it by a note by William Rendle, *Notes and Queries*, 7th Ser., Vol. VI, p. 221. It closely resembles the Roxana picture, both agreeing in showing the railing, the hexagonal(?) stage, and the window-like balcony. The Messallina picture is valuable, however, for its figured stage curtain, its balcony curtain, and its peculiar projecting tiring-house.

All references in the following pages are, I think, self-explanatory. Perhaps it should be noted that the dates and the names of theatrical companies or theaters given after the names of the plays are those upon the earliest title-pages. Where it has seemed advantageous I have also given the date of composition, usually following Ward or Fleay, though not necessarily accepting their conclusions as final.

Genee, etc., in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*,¹ of Brandl, in the Introduction to the new Schlegel-Tieck Shakespeare; and of Brodmeier, in his recently published dissertation, *Die Shakespeare Bühne nach den alten Bühnenanweisungen*² (Weimar, 1904). These writers assume the triple stage; suppose most, if not all, of the properties to have been placed on the rear stage, and by the use of a few of Shakespeare's plays, Brodmeier alone taking account of all, attempt to establish what one may call an alternation staging; that is, that the plays were so constructed that no two differently set scenes on the rear stage ever came directly in succession, but that front and rear stage were used alternately, the rear stage being arranged while the front stage was in use.

It is not quite true to say that this is the only method of stage management yet suggested, for early plays, like *Nice Wanton* (1560) and *Jocasta* (1566), obviously were written for no such system. Most of the earlier dramas frankly avoid all properties. *Nice Wanton* requires nothing in the way of setting, and the scene is practically the stage itself. *Jocasta* is more elaborate, for it requires a house front at either side of the stage; but, built upon classical models, it has but one scene, the place of action never changing. So complex a play as *The Contention of Liberality and Prodigality* (1602), with its "homely bower" for Virtue and its "palace" for Fortune, recurring throughout the play, suggests a similar classic staging, but rather more highly elaborated. Most Elizabethan plays, however, cannot be staged at all according to the classical method, or according to the simple method of the early plays, though some, in their numerous unlocated scenes, do suggest the latter. The alternation theory therefore remains the only one yet suggested at all applicable to most plays.

It is, however, as presented by its advocates up to this time, extremely unsatisfactory. German students seem to have accepted

¹ See, especially, GENE, "Ueber die scenischen Formen Shakespeare's in ihren Verhältniss zur Bühne seiner Zeit," *Jahrbuch*, Vol. XXVI; KILIAN, "Die scenischen Formen Shakespeare's, *ibid.*, Vol. XXVIII; KILIAN, "Shakespeare auf der modernen Bühne," *ibid.*, Vol. XXXVI. See also, for a short summary of the alternation theory, A. H. TOLMAN'S *Introduction to Julius Caesar*, in the "Star Series of English Classics."

² Brodmeier adds a fourth stage, the space discovered when the stage doors were opened. Everybody admits that this was sometimes used in the plays, but hardly with the frequency he supposes.





it unhesitatingly and reason from it as if it were thoroughly established. On the contrary, it rests on a singularly limited study, and that of inconclusive sources; it assumes as certain and universal an unproved reconstruction of the Elizabethan theater; it is supported by principles and tests which contradict one another; and it disregards entirely several plays which it cannot easily explain. It has been advanced as a dominating factor in play-construction, but it is doubtful whether it ever influenced, in any very pronounced or vital way, any Elizabethan dramatist. To show the grounds for these objections is the purpose of the first part of this study.

In the first place, Shakespeare's plays, to which alternationists have practically confined themselves, are far less complete in specific directions than those of other authors—Greene or Heywood, for example. *The Wonder of Women* (1606), one of the richest of plays in directions of value, has a note to its epilogue which says: "After all, let me intreat my Reader not to taxe me for the fashion of the Entrances and Musique of this tragedy, for know it is printed only as it was presented by youths, and after the fashion of the private stage." If we had Shakespeare's plays in a similarly complete form, we might find that our present theories needed to be largely changed. As it is, it is not safe to trust solely to the directions of his plays; for questions of staging, many other plays are more valuable. In the second place, the plays of Shakespeare range in date over a long period of years, and were given at several theaters. Presumably the stage customs and furnishings changed from time to time and varied in different theaters. Instead of confining himself to one author, the student should examine all the plays performed either at one theater or in one period. In questions of stage construction and use of properties the study by theaters will yield the most satisfactory results, since the several theaters may have varied in these particulars; but dramatic customs are a matter more of long periods and general usage—slowly arising and slowly decaying, but prevailing pretty generally while they do prevail. There are a few plays, like *Sir Thomas More* (ca. 1590), *The Massacre of Paris* (1596?), or *Faustus* (1604), so cut, interpolated, or disarranged

that it is useless to attempt to form theories which will explain them. Others, like *The Taming of the Shrew* (1623), not published until long after their first composition, may represent in their directions such varied conditions of stage custom that they are of little value for any one period. But, aside from these, one must include in his investigation all the plays of a given period, finding some theory or group of theories which will explain them consistently and completely.¹

But quite as important as a wide and comprehensive reading of the plays of a period is the consideration of each play as a whole. If theories of stage management are to be valuable at all, they must apply to whole plays and not merely to scattered acts or scenes. Strangely enough, few of the alternationists seem to have recognized this principle, or at least to have reckoned with it. Brodmeier, whose very purpose is to explain the staging of Shakespeare's plays, presents only a study of scenes. Perhaps one could make from his scattered hints a consistent staging of each individual play, but he certainly has not shown his reader the way to it. It is true that there is some reason for this. It is a relatively simple matter to find a few scenes in succession which will show a possible alternation in the use of the front and back stage, but to find a whole play arranged on that or any other

¹In this study I have examined practically every extant play accessible to students, published between 1559 and 1603. I have also included all plays published later which probably were produced during that period. Plays produced at court or under court influence, like *Old Fortunatus*, have been included and used as illustrations in spite of that fact; for, however, the court plays differed in furnishings or form of stage, in dramatic conventions they probably did not vary widely from the usual custom. The reason for choosing 1603 is that it not only marked the end of the Elizabethan drama, precisely speaking, but that it also was a time around which cluster other important dramatic events. The erection of the Globe (1599) and Fortune (1599); the resumption of playing by the children of Paul's and the children of the Revels, which also happened not long before this—all mark it as a turning-point in the drama. The difficulty of assigning plays of this period to the theater in which they were produced is so great that study by theaters is hazardous and comparatively valueless. In the Jacobean period, however, I believe it will be possible to follow this method with profit. From a lack of this knowledge of the exact stage construction, I have drawn very little from Shakespeare; the staging of his plays can be satisfactorily explained only when the construction of the Globe and Blackfriars is more exactly determined. I have throughout used the best modern editions of the plays—best in that they preserve the original stage directions. Most of the directions of importance have been collated with the originals in the British Museum. Bullen's editions, which I have had occasion to use more than those of other editors, seem substantially correct, except that of Marlowe, which varies so widely in its directions from the original quartos that I have used few illustrations from his plays. These plays, however, present no evidence contradictory to my conclusions, but rather decidedly support them.

principle is difficult. To be of value as evidence, a play must contain so many directions or unmistakable textual hints indicating the use of properties or some specific part of the stage, that practically every scene is definitely located. This, however, very few plays do; most of them, so far as any indicated arrangement is concerned, are quite inconclusive. Mention of the use of a curtain, the only obvious test of a rear stage scene, is comparatively rare, and even this, in very many cases, can be interpreted as referring to a bed curtain.¹ In order to prove alternation even between scattered groups of scenes, its advocates have been compelled to formulate certain principles of stage custom and tests of rear-stage scenes, holding that in plays so apparently deficient in directions, such assumptions of the use of the curtain, where it is not specifically mentioned, are justifiable.

The principles upon which the whole theory rests may be summarized as follows: the performance of an Elizabethan play was continuous;² in consequence of this, two rear-stage scenes with different settings could not come in direct succession,³ since their rearrangement would cause a pause in the action; all properties were confined to the rear stage.⁴ These principles, though not definitely stated by all the writers, obviously must be assumed to be the basis of their argument, or there is no need of alternation. The tests of rear-stage scenes, by which these principles have been applied to the plays, have not been widely illustrated by anybody but Brodmeier. His principal tests of rear stage or

¹ In *Golden Age* (1611, Red Bull), Act IV, "curtain" can scarcely mean anything else than "bed-curtain." The scene has been in the outer room of a castle. Dame, talking to Jupiter disguised as a peddler, says (p. 66): "Yon is my doore, Dare not to enter there. I will to rest." Jupiter obtains permission to sleep in this outer room. As soon as Dame and her four watchful beldams are gone, he throws off his disguise, saying: "Yon bright Queene I'le now court like a King." Exit. But instead of his going in to her comes this direction: "Enter the foure old Beldames drawing out Dame's bed; she in it. They place foure tapers at the foure corners," and withdraw. Jupiter re-enters, "crown'd with his Imperial Robes," for which he obviously went out, puts out the lights, and Dame says: "Before you come to bed, the curtaines draw" (p. 69). At the end of this part of the scene "the bed is drawne in." Jupiter's clownish companion enters, and the scene is again the outer room. If this curtain were the stage curtain, the bed would hardly have been so drawn out and in. But generally when a curtain or curtains (I can distinguish no difference in the use of these terms) is alluded to, the stage curtain was probably meant. Almost every important theater had a curtain and would be likely to use it for concealing the bringing in of a bed, if for anything. Each direction has to be interpreted, therefore, in the light of its context.

² KILIAN, *Jahrbuch*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 235.

³ Ibid., and BRANDL, "Introduction," p. 31.

⁴ BRODMEIER, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

in scenes are: discovery by means of a curtain—though small discovered scenes like the *Tempest*, Act V, where Prospero “discovers Ferdinand and Miranda, playing at Chesse” (p. 64), he places in his fourth stage; the use of properties; the use of the doors; the use of the balcony; the use of arras. Kilian¹ classes as *in* scenes all the Belmont scenes in the *Merchant of Venice*, presumably because they are largely *room* scenes; and² considers any scene as played on the rear stage in which a character dies and there is no hint in directions or text of a removal of the body. Most alternationists, indeed, tend to put almost any located scene on the rear stage. But since a clash—that is, the occurrence of two *in* scenes in direct succession—is fatal to the theory, its whole purpose being to avoid breaks and pauses in the action, scenes before and after these *in* scenes must be *out* scenes. Most scenes in some way or other, however, are located, and a large number use doors or balconies or properties, so that usually only short, relatively unimportant scenes remain to be classed as *out*. This, in turn, leads to a greater emphasis than ever on the rear stage, and to classifying as *out* any short scenes of which the purpose is obscure. At once a purpose easily suggests itself for such scenes—they fill the time while the rear stage is being prepared. This is the final result of the theory: authors, in order to secure this alternation, had so to construct their plays that no two *in* scenes should occur together, and actually composed short “carpenter” scenes for this purpose.³ Alternation becomes therefore a factor in play-construction—it sums up the influence upon the playwright of his theatrical environment. By applying these tests to Shakespeare’s plays, a large number of examples have been secured to prove and substantiate the theory. But examples gathered in this way are practically valueless, for they rest for their validity upon the tests; and the tests, so far as I am aware, no one has taken the trouble to prove, though each is open to serious question, if not to absolute denial.

For example, the statement that use of doors or balcony indi-

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 235.

² *Ibid.*, p. 240.

³ So KILIAN, *loc. cit.*, p. 236: “Eine ganze Reihe von Scenen dankt ihr Dasein nicht einem künstlerischen Bedürfnis, sondern lediglich einem äusseren technischen Umstände, der sich aus dem primitiven Bühnengerüste jener Zeit ergab.”

cates a rear stage scene depends entirely upon one's reconstruction of an Elizabethan stage. Brodmeier's—and he is only following Brandl¹—is based on the familiar picture of the Swan Theater, to which the important addition is made of a curtain between the pillars. Yet even the reliability of the original picture without this imagined addition has been attacked and its value as an authority for the Elizabethan playhouse seriously questioned. Lawrence² insists that it is merely "hearsay evidence," being the drawing of Arend van Buchell, who never visited England, from the instruction of DeWitt, an observer so inaccurate that his description of the theater is wrong both as to the size and its materials. Moreover, the picture, Lawrence claims, is self-contradictory, showing a movable stage supporting fixed columns, and he therefore doubts its value as evidence concerning even the Swan Theater. It is not necessary to go as far as this, perhaps, but he is certainly right in uttering his "stern note of protest" against accepting the picture as a fair representation of a typical Elizabethan stage. For one thing, though he does not notice this, it shows but two doors, and many of the old theaters had three;³ and, for another, it not only shows no curtain, but also no

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 27.

² *Englische Studien*, Vol. XXXII, Part I, p. 46.

³ The generally received opinion that there were but two doors leading from the stage to the dressing rooms is founded, no doubt, upon the Swan picture and the very common direction "Enter at one door . . . ; enter at the other door" The directions, however, use this phrase, "the other," very loosely, as is clear from the directions from *Maid's Metamorphosis* given below. The following directions prove the existence of three doors. Besides the *Misfortunes of Arthur* (1587) and *Jocasta* (1586), the directions of which plainly require three entrances, the following may be noted: In the "plat" of the *Seven Deadly Sins* (Fleay dates 1585) occurs: "Enter queene with 2 counsailors, Mr. Brian Tho. Goodale, to them Ferrex and Forrex several waies with drums and powers. Gorboduke entering in the midst between." Prologue to the *Four Prentices of London* (Red Bull, 1615, but acted according to Ward, 1603): "Enter three in blacke clokkes, at three doores." *Maid's Metamorphosis* (1600, Paul's) p. 137: "Enter Ioculo, Friso, and Mopso, at three severall doores;" yet only a dozen pages before we read, "Enter at one doore Mopso singing. . . . Enter at the other doore Friso singing; . . . Enter Ioculo in the midst singing." Plainly "other" is not very precisely used. In like manner, *Antonio's Revenge* (1602, Paul's), V, has: "Enter at one door Castilio and Forobosco. . . . All these go softly over the stage, whilst at the other door enters the ghost of Andrugio, who passeth by them." But in PERCY's *Faery Pastoral* (written also for Paul's, about 1601), IV, 6, occurs the direction: "They entered at severall doores Learchus at the midde doore." *The Travels of Three English Brothers* (1607, Queen's), p. 90: "Enter three severall waies the three Brothers." Other illustrations are *Eastward Ho* (1605, Blackfriars) I, 1; *Fair Em* (1631, but acted, according to Fleay, ca. 1590), I, 4; *Nobody and Somebody* (1606, Queen's), II, 1321-31; *Histrionastix* (1610, but acted ca. 1599), V, 103; *Epiccene* (1609), IV; *Covent Garden* (1632, Cockpit), V, 1, and *English Traveller* (1633, Queen's, Cockpit), IV, 3. It seems fairly certain, therefore, that, at some time in their history, the Blackfriars, Paul's, Cockpit, and Red Bull Theaters had three stage doors; and if the Blackfriars, perhaps the Globe (because

reasonable place to suppose one. Brodmeier appreciates, in some degree at least, the difficulty of hanging a curtain on the Swan stage, but persuades himself that it could have hung between the pillars, trying to prove (p. 43) that the space between the pillars and tiring-house was inclosed. Perhaps this space could have been closed, rather by movable curtains than in some permanent way, as he supposes, but that is only part of the difficulty. A curtain hanging from the "heavens" would be difficult to manage and would hide the balcony, rendering its curtain useless.¹ If we can judge at all from the proportions of the picture, a short curtain would not conceal the rear stage from the upper galleries, and would hide the balcony from the spectators in the yard and lower boxes. The more one attempts to hang a curtain between the Swan pillars, the more difficulties he will discover. The Swan picture therefore, lacking curtain, lacking three doors, is not a typical theater. It is only adding to confusion longer so to consider it.

Perhaps there was no typical theater; it would be strange if all the London playhouses had been alike. Two, and perhaps three, arrangements are entirely conceivable: Brandl and Brodmeier's, in which the curtain hides both the balcony and the

theaters at which the same plays were given could scarcely differ in so important a particular); and if the Globe, then the Fortune (since they were built alike, except in specified details). BRODMEIER, in attempting to prove that there were side entrances to the stage, notes the following instances in Shakespeare which certainly point to three doors: (p. 50) *Antony and Cleopatra*, III, 10; (p. 44) *John*, II, 1; (pp. 49, 50) *Macbeth*, II, 1; (p. 54) *Merry Wives of Windsor*, V, 5. The recognition of three doors leaves his argument for side entrances singularly weak. They may have existed, but are unproved. Side walls on his rear stage are very improbable, and the only argument for side entrances remaining, after three doors in the rear are supposed, is that of inconsistency. So in *Henry V* (1600), III, 1-3, because Henry enters to storm Harfleur, the doors representing the gates of the town, and the balcony, its walls, BRODMEIER (p. 45) thinks it impossible that Henry, supposed to be coming from some place outside the city, should have entered through another door, cut through the same wall. In view of other inconsistencies of the stage, and of the innumerable scenes in which the doors represent at the same time different places (e. g., the general directions to PERCY's *Cuckqueans' and Cuckolds' Errants* (MSS dated 1601, Paul's), this objection is of little weight. Moreover, the following example shows specifically that it is unsupported by the plays: *Four Prentices of London* (1615, Queen's, Red Bull, but acted according to Ward, 1603?). The Christians are assaulting Jerusalem. The Turks are on the walls (p. 290). But (p. 234), "The Christians are repulst. Enter at two severall dores, Guy and Eustace climbe vp the wals, beate the Pagans," etc. The direction specifies distinctly entrance through the doors by enemies who assault the walls directly above.

¹ That a balcony curtain existed is shown by the Red Bull and Messallina pictures, and among other passages in the plays, by *Henry VIII* (1613), V, 2; by *Wounds of Civil War* (1594, Admiral's), V, 2; and *Antonio's Revenge* (1602, Paul's), I, 2, as well as Act V of the same play.

doors; the "corridor" (rear) stage, if I may term it so, in which the curtain hung from a projecting balcony, thus leaving it unin-closed, but hiding the doors; and the "alcove" stage, in which neither the balcony nor all the doors were concealed, two doors, presumably, lying at either side the curtained space.¹ Brodmeier's stage could be of almost any size, depending on how far out the pillars stood. The corridor stage would, as the name implies, be rather shallow, since it could scarcely be much deeper than the balcony. The alcove stage, in its name, gives a mis-leading impression of smallness, for the alcove was not neces-sarily very limited in size. In the Fortune Theater, according to the contract,² the whole stage was to be forty-three feet wide, and in depth was to extend to the middle of the yard, a distance not exceeding twenty-eight feet. The rear stage in such a theater could hardly have been other than an alcove, for a long shallow stage would have been awkward and useless. The alcove, how-ever, could easily have measured twenty feet in width, and then left over ten feet on either side for the doors. There is, there-fore, no need of supposing the alcove stage diminutive, although it probably was shallow. All these suggested arrangements are probable enough; perhaps all actually existed; no one form, at least, can without proof be adopted as normal or exclusive.

The alternation theory, however, bases itself almost entirely on the form described by Brodmeier, though it is the most doubt-ful of all. The Swan picture is no argument for that form of stage, for the shading under the balcony may be interpreted to mean that the balcony projects, in which case the curtain could be suspended from it. The other pictures are unanimously against it, since in each the balcony is not hidden by the stage curtain.³ The objection urged against supposing a curtain on the Swan stage, that, if it was long enough to hide the balcony, it would be awkward to manage and would render the balcony cur-

¹ For if the curtain did not hide the doors, it probably did not hide the balcony either; the natural place to suppose the rear stage is therefore beneath the balcony, and between the doors, the most easily visible position for it.

² HALLIWELL-PHILLIPS, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, Vol. I, p. 304.

³ By stage curtain I mean here and elsewhere the curtain hiding the rear stage, as distinguished from that of the balcony, or that possible before a single door, or before some special structure.

tain useless, applies to any other theater as well. Moreover, if spectators sat in the balcony, they would be unable to see any out scene at all.¹ To these practical objections against a curtain concealing the balcony may be added the testimony of the plays themselves.

In *Antonio's Revenge* (1602, Paul's), I, 2, 194, a group of men are serenading a lady. One says: "See, look, the curtain stirs." The direction continues: "The curtain's drawn and the body of Feliche, stabb'd thick with wounds, appears hung up." The lover continues: "What villain bloods the window of my love Death's at thy window, awake, bright Mellida." Near the end of the scene, which is also the end of the act (308, 340), are remarks which show that the body is still in sight. Act II is in a church, and a hearse is brought in with the body of another victim and left there, appearing again in Act III. But in Act II, without the actors leaving the stage and immediately after the hearse scene, the place of action shifts to the scene of Act I, and the father addresses a passionate speech to his son's body. Not till IV, 1, 232, is there a command to take down the body of Feliche. The body hung in the balcony, for allusions to ladies' windows usually refer to the openings of the upper stage, and every indication points to its being out of reach from below. But if the body did appear in the balcony, there is, according to the principles of alternation, a violent clash: the first part of Act II being in a church with a hearse; the second, in front of the palace with the body exposed above. If the balcony, however, projected over the rear stage and was not concealed by the lower curtain, Act II would be easy to explain. The first part of the scene would be played on the rear stage, the action would gradually pass forward, the lower curtains close, the upper ones open, and the scene continue without interruption—the clash entirely avoided.

In the *Wounds of Civil War* (1594, Admiral's) V, 2, "Marius [appears] vpon the wals [of Preneste] with the Citizens" (p. 64). Many kill themselves there, but there is no indication that the

¹ Probably they did not sit there. There is much more reason for thinking that the people shown in the Swan picture are musicians, or actor-spectators of a play within a play, than actual spectators. The proof of this is too long to be given here. One argument, however, is the one in the text—the impossibility of devising any stage which will be consistent with their presence.

bodies are removed—more evidence of a special balcony curtain. Scene 3 uses a throne, however—"Scilla seated in his robes of state is saluted by the Citizens" (p. 67). Therefore, according to alternation, there is a clash, which could again, however, be removed by supposing that the balcony projected over the rear stage.

But it may be objected that, if the rear stage was below the balcony, people in the balcony could not see the scenes underneath them. Even if spectators did not sit there, actors often did, who were supposed to be observing scenes on the rear stage. So it would be in *David and Bethsabe* (1599), I. 1: "He [the Prologue] drawes a curtaine and discouers Bethsabe, with her Maid, bathing ouer a spring: she sings, and David sits aboue, vewing her." Here, of course, David should be able to see Bethsabe; but if that is insisted upon, a worse difficulty arises. The very next scene requires that the balcony be used as the walls of Rabath. If both rear stage and balcony were concealed by the stage curtain, a decided clash would result, for the "spring" furnishing must be removed. If the balcony was above the rear stage, however, as soon as the scene between David and Bethsabe was over, the curtains could have closed below and the action continued without interruption.¹ The balcony in the theater in which this play was given was not behind the rear stage, or clashes count for nothing. The fact that David could not see Bethsabe while she was in the rear stage is of little importance. He could have seemed to see her, the audience could see them both—that was all that was necessary. Similar situations arise with added arguments in *James IV* (1598); *The Looking Glass for London* (1594); and *The Taming of the Shrew* (1623). In *James IV*, Bohan (l. 109, Induction) tells Oberon: "That story hane I set down; gang with me to the gallery, and I'le shew thee the same in action." Perhaps they did not sit in the balcony when the simpler set of act interludes (those printed between each act) were used, for they seem to come on and go off for each interlude; but in the more elab-

¹ Of course, if any hangings representing walls were to be hung out, there would be a clash which no arrangement of the stage could remove, and this instance, though weakening the argument at this point, would strengthen it a little farther on in the discussion of incongruities.

orate set of interludes¹ there is no hint of their entering and leaving the stage, but rather that they sat somewhere throughout the play observing it. In the *Looking Glass for London*, Oseas the Prophet is "let down over the stage in a throne" (l. 163), and from that point until l. 2020 remains there commenting on nearly every scene. Yet ll. 572-605, for example, have the curtains closed. Did Oseas disappear from view also? In *The Taming of the Shrew*, Sly and his companions sit above to watch the play. It is impossible to suppose that these actor-spectators were concealed from sight during the *out scenes*. Yet that is what the situation would be if the balcony were behind the curtain. The slight unreality involved in their being unable to see the infrequent scenes on the rear stage is not half so confusing as this would be.

From these plays, therefore, it seems that in the theaters where they were produced, and at the time when they were produced, the balcony was not hidden by the lower curtain. Three of them were by Shakespeare's own company, all are contemporary, and all but the *Shrew* were published not long after production, and are therefore of undoubted authority. They do not prove that all theaters were arranged so that the lower curtain did not hide the balcony; they only established a strong presumption that some were. The complete agreement of the *Roxana*, *Messallina*, and *Red Bull* pictures on this point is strong corroboration, even though they are too late in date to be taken as direct proof. The plays and pictures together are, however, sufficient to show that in proposing the use of the balcony as a sure test of a rear-stage scene Brodmeier is making an entirely unwarranted assumption, for the type of theater it presupposes is not known to have existed at all, much less to have been the only form.

For the use of doors as a test there is much stronger evidence. A curtain on the Swan stage would certainly hide the two doors shown in the picture; that on the Red Bull stage conceals any stage doors opening upon it;² the *Messallina* and *Roxana* stages,

¹ MANLY, *Specimens of the Pre-Shaksperean Drama*, Vol. II, pp. 351-54.

² The Red Bull picture, published in 1672, dates, Mr. Lawrence thinks (*Englische Studien*, Vol. XXXII, Part I, p. 42) from 1656. The footlights and suspended candles show that at this stage in its history it depended upon artificial illumination, and that it therefore was roofed. But this was the most characteristic feature of the "private houses." The author of the *Historia Histrionica*, however (published 1699, but written by some one well acquainted with

though they allow the supposition that other doors, not shown in the picture, existed at either side of the stage, hardly suggest any such theory; so that the weight of the evidence offered by the pictures is decidedly in favor of the door test for rear stage scenes.

But that another type of stage is conceivable, and has seemed reasonable to students, is plain from Lawrence's article already referred to, in which he contends that the curtain in a typical theater could not have hidden the doors, although he gives little specific proof, and from two remarks of Genee, who also gives no proof. In the *Jahrbuch* (Vol. XXVI, p. 133) the latter says that there was "in der Mitte des Hintergrundes eine nischenartige Vertiefung der Bühne;" and in *Entwicklung des scenischen Theaters*, p. 31.

In der Mitte des Hintergrundes befand sich aber noch eine durch einen Vorhang zuschliessende Mittelbühne, welche vortrefflich zu verwenden war und durch deren geringe Veränderungen wie auch durch das Schliessen und Oeffnen derselben auch der Phantasie der Zuschauer bei dem so häufigen Scenenwechsel auf die leichteste Art nachhalf.

In other words, both Lawrencee and Genee think it possible that the alcove rear stage existed. The plays offer the following evidence, if not directly for this alcove stage, at least against the corridor stage or the stage of Brodmeier. I use again Brodmeier's own tests and principles, citing clashes which prove them self-contradictory:

Property scenes are supposed to be *in* scenes; so are door scenes; yet the following show clashes of door scenes and property scenes; in some cases a curtain being directly mentioned:

Antonio's Revenge (1602, Paul's), II, 1. The act opens in a church; a coffin is brought in, and left on the stage, being used again in Act III.

"The coffin [is] set down; helm, sword, and streamers hung up, placed by the Herald." (Act II). In Act III a page says to Antonio, visiting the church: "Those streamers bear his [Andrugio's, Antonio's father] arms." Antonio says: "Set tapers to the tomb." Soon Andru-

pre-Restoration conditions), describes it (p. 408) as one of the public houses, which were only partially roofed, and which therefore needed no artificial illumination. I have already shown that it once had three doors, though the picture hardly allows room for more than one. The theater must therefore have been rebuilt at some time in its history, and the picture of 1656 can be of little authority for the period before 1603.

gio's ghost rises, saying: "Lo, the ghost of old Andrugio, Forsakes his coffin."

Without the actors leaving the stage, the scene changes to the space before the palace where the body of Feliche is hung up, and the scene closes with the direction: "Exeunt at several doors." Unless one would accept the idea that the tomb remained in plain sight even during the last part of the scene, one must suppose the curtain to have been closed with the change of scene, but that it did conceal the doors.

The Wisdom of Dr. Dodypoll (1600, Paul's), III, 3. The scene is described as a valley near a green hill. Fairies bring in a banquet, and a peasant, spying a cup, steals it and disappears. "Enter the spirit with banqueting stiffe, and missing the peasant, lookes up and downe for him; the rest wondering at him; to them enters the Enchanter." To this company Lassingbergh and Lucilia enter, and the Enchanter binds him by magic. No exeunt direction closes the scene, and the fourth scene, located in another place, opens with the direction: "Enter Alberdure at one doore, and meetes with the Pesant at the other doore." The succeeding (fifth) scene is again at the place of the third scene, beginning with: "Enter Enchanter, leading Luc. and Lass. bound by spirits; who being laid down on a green banck, the spirits fetch in a banquet." The only explanation at all consistent with Brodmeier's theories would be to place the green bank and the banquet on the rear stage: the curtain would close at the end of sc. 3, and open again for sc. 5, but the doors would necessarily be outside the curtain. In any other way a clash would result.

Alchemist (1610, Kings'), V, 1, plainly uses one door at least for the entrance to Lovewit's house. Scene 2 is within the house and uses chests. A clash will therefore result if the doors are concealed by the curtain.

Captain Thomas Stukeley (1605; dated by Simpson, 1598), ll. 120-335 are before an inn, on the way to Tom's chamber, and finally within the chamber, which is entered by a door. The next scene is in an entirely different place and begins with: "Enter at one door Cross the Mercer, at another Spring the Vintner."

Poetaster (acted 1601, Chapel Children), IV, 2, is short,

with hardly fifty lines. At the beginning Luples says: "Shut the door, lictor;" but sc. 3 opens at a feast, and the stage is set with chairs or stools, for Ovid says: "Gods and goddesses, take your several seats." Again the most obvious staging which will avoid a clash is to place sc. 3 on the rear stage and to suppose that the door was not concealed by the curtains.

Wonder of Women (1606, Blackfriars), III, 1; near the end has a direction: "They lay Vangue in Syphax' bed and draw the curtains." Act III, sc. 2, begins: "Enter Scipio and Lælius, with the complements of Roman Generals before them. At the other door, Massinissa and Jugurth." Even if the curtains mentioned are those of the bed, the bed, according to Brodmeier, would be on the rear stage and a clash would result in sc. 2—unless, of course, the doors were outside the curtain.

Timon of Athens (written in 1607?; 1623), V, 1, 2, 3, 4: Scene 1 is before Timon's cave, which Brodmeier places in the rear stage (p. 19). sc. 2 is probably before the walls of Athens, as the Globe direction says, though there is nothing to set the scene definitely but the third Senator's "in, and prepare." Scene 3, however, is, as plainly as any scene can be, again, as in sc. 1, the woods before Timon's cave; moreover, something now stands for Timon's tomb. Brodmeier says this scene is on the front stage, but only, it seems, because he would otherwise be forced into a clash with sc. 4, which is again before the walls of Athens and alludes to the "gates," that is the doors. Yet, if the doors and balcony were outside the curtain, all would be simple—Timon's cave, the woods, and the tomb could be on the rear stage, sc. 1 and 3 would be *in*, the other two *be out*.

Other examples are not difficult to cite: In Shakespeare, for example, *Cymbeline*, II, 2, 3; *Taming of the Shrew*, V, 1, 2; *Richard II*, 1, 3, 4; all of which Brodmeier explains by more or less acceptable split scenes;¹ but these are enough to show the nature of the illustrations possible. I have chosen examples which represent leading theaters—Paul's, the Rose, Blackfriars, and the Globe; these plays suggest that in each the doors were not concealed by the curtain.

¹ See *infra*, p. 31, for explanation of this means of avoiding clashes.

Scenes tending to show the same stage construction are found in several other plays, but the evidence is not directly applicable. The situations are generally of this nature: One or more characters enter, and almost as soon as they are on the stage the curtains open, displaying something surprising or at least unknown to them. Or sometimes, near the end of a scene, the curtains close and characters remaining on the stage exeunt, but, according to the intention of the dramatist, *not* through the curtained space. In many cases beds are in use, so that bed curtains may be meant by the word "curtains" or "discover" of the directions; but since it can certainly be shown that stage curtains existed in every important theater, it is usually more reasonable to suppose that it is the stage curtains which are referred to.

The Woman in the Moon (published 1597; written, Bond, 1591-93, Paul's), I, 1: Four Shepherds ask Nature for a female; she promises them one and they exeunt, after which the maidens "draw the Curtins from before Nature's shop, where stands an Image clad, and some vnclad, they bring forth the cloathed image," and it becomes Pandora. The shepherds could hardly have gone out through the "shop" curtain.

Henry VIII (acted 1613), II, 2: The Lord Chamberlain is reading a letter when Suffolk and Norfolk come to him. They ask: "How is the king imployed?" The Chamberlain replies: "I left him priuate, Full of sad thoughts and troubles." Norfolk suggests that they go in to the king, but the Chamberlain refuses. "Exit Lord Chamberlaine, and the King drawes the Curtaine and sits reading pensiuely." Suffolk speaks and the king, disturbed, starts up angrily. Brodmeier (p. 57), of course, has the scene begin on the front stage, but, since he supposes all the doors to be behind the curtain, is forced to have the nobles enter and Lord Chamerlain depart through the curtain, the latter action being especially incongruous. If the curtain does not hide the doors, the Lord Chamberlain enters through the curtain, the nobles come in through one door, he exits in the same way, and all is simple, fitting, and clear.

Sir Giles Goosecap (1660, Chapel; acted, Fleay, 1601), V, 2:

The plan is to bring certain people near to the chamber of Clarence, who is feigning sickness, so he may get conversation with Eugenia, whom he loves. Clarence and the Doctor enter; others come a little later and talk of Clarence, as if he were in another room; Clarence does not see them. All but Clarence exeunt; he "drawes the Curtaines and sits within them" (p. 84). Eugenia immediately enters with two friends, and these three talk for two pages before they rouse Clarence. The staging with the alcove stage is simple and consistent; with the doors concealed by the curtain it could not but be confused and utterly unrealistic, for the visitors would have entered through the very space in which he was concealed.

Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington (1601, Admiral's), III, 4: An old man, Marian's father, enters disguised, talking of how he is coming to see his daughter. Then "Curtains open: Robin Hood sleeps on a green bank, and Marian strewing flowers on him." Marian greets her father kindly, and Friar Tuck and Jenny, dressed like peddlers, enter. Still more come in, one of the last comers saying to Tuck, "Yonder is the bower," and hides to wait for developments. More striking than the inconsistency of the old man's coming in through the curtain, which was so soon to open and display Robin Hood to him, is the improbability of speaking of the rear stage as "yonder," if one had just entered it, as the speaker would have done had the bower been the rear stage, the easiest explanation, and the doors in its back wall, as Brodmeier would have them.

Antonio's Revenge (1602, Paul's), III, 8: Maria, wife of the murdered Andrugio, is preparing for bed. Scene 1 was in a church about a coffin. Presumably the scene was therefore the rear stage, but now in the beginning of sc. 2, it is on the front stage. While she is thus employed, the settings on the rear stage are being changed, for, l. 64, "Maria draweth the curtain: and the ghost of Andrugio is displayed, sitting on the bed." The ghost tells her how treacherously he has been treated, but finally says: "Sleep thou in rest, lo, here I close thy couch." Then the direction says: "Exit Maria to her bed, Andrugio drawing the curtains," He speaks five more lines and then exits. This, of

course, may refer to the bed curtains, but, if it does, the first part of the scene must be on the rear stage, and the clash of two property scenes would have to be explained; for the alternation theory a much more difficult matter.¹

Other examples such as these are numerous. Among those which may be noted are *Humour Out of Breath* (1608, Revels), III, 4; *Life and Death of Thomas, Lord Cromwell* (1602, Chamberlain's) III, 2;² *II Henry IV* (1594; Chamberlain's), III, 2, 3; *Old Fortunatus* (1600, Admiral's), II, 1; *I Honest Whore* (1604), I, 3, in all of which the incongruity of exit or entrance through the rear stage is marked.

Situations like these, of course, might not seem incongruous to an Elizabethan. If he were accustomed to them, he would receive them as he would any inherently impossible dramatic convention—dramatic time, for example. In that case the illustrations cited merely call attention to an, as yet, unnoticed stage custom. But to arrange the stage so as to avoid this incongruity is so easy that it seems fair to admit these cases as evidence of the alcove rear stage. It is true that two other explanations have been suggested—one by Archer,³ who would have characters in such scenes come around the pillars, as the messenger seems to have done in the Swan picture; the other by Bang,⁴ who would divide the rear stage into two parts. Both are intended to explain how such scenes could be arranged on a stage similar to the Swan's, and therefore are less to be regarded. Archer's explanation is perhaps true for such a theater, but would not apply to the other theaters of which pictures exist. Bang's seems to me quite impossible. Actions on such a rear stage as he pre-

¹To be sure "curtain" is used in the first direction; "curtains" in the second; but I know no reason for thinking them different. The stage directions, carelessly written and carelessly printed, are not to be too curiously or minutely examined. If there were a difference, "curtains" in the above direction would mean the bed curtain, and "curtain," the stage curtain. But in the same play near the end is the direction, "The curtains are drawn, Piero departeth," where there is no doubt of the plural form, and no possibility that bed curtains are referred to.

²This is the scene which BANG, with amusing exclamation, cites as showing how students have completely forgotten the necessity of providing for entrance to the front stage (*Jahrbuch*, Vol. XL, pp. 223-25). KELLER's answer (*ibid.*, pp. 225-27) is unsatisfactory; there is absolutely no authority for assuming the balcony, as he does in such instances, and in most cases it will not suit the directions at all.

³*Universal Review*, June 15, 1888, pp. 281-88.

⁴*Jahrbuch*, Vol. XL, pp. 223-25.

sents—one divided by curtains into two narrow deep parts—would be almost, if not entirely, invisible to a large part of the audience in the old circular theaters. Brodmeier attempts no special explanation of such scenes.

If the alcove stage be granted, directions and situations in the plays are explained which are otherwise puzzling. The direction in *Alphonsus* (1599), l. 1255 is explained: "Let there be a brazen Head set in the middle of the place behind the stage, out of the which cast flames of fire, drums rumble within; enter two priests." The order of directions in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (1594, Queen's), l. 1890, which Grosart thinks should perhaps be changed, becomes exactly applicable: "Enter two Schollers, sonnes to Lambert and Serlsby. Knocke." The directions in *What You Will* (1607) become intelligible. II, I: The scene is Laverdure's bedroom. "One knocks: Laverdure draws the curtains, sitting on his bed, apparelling himself; his trunk of apparel standing by him," the last showing that a stage curtain was probably used. II, 2: "Enter a schoolmaster, draws the curtains behind, with Battus, Nous, Slip, Nathaniel, and Holofernes Pippo, schoolboys, sitting, with books in their hands." What is the force of "behind"? As the scene is too large to stage it in Brodmeier's "fourth" stage, the curtain "behind" is not one over a single door. The directions exactly fit the situation if the schoolmaster had entered through a door on either side the alcove, and had then drawn open the stage curtain behind him. *Eastward Ho* (1605, Blackfriars), I, 1: "Enter Master Touchstone and Quicksilver at several doors; . . . At the middle door, enter Golding, discovering a goldsmith's shop, and walking short turns before it." This direction, one of the most confusing of all, becomes reasonably plain with the alcove stage and suggests several interesting points. It certainly sounds as if the alcove stage was arranged as a shop, and that Golding, coming through the middle door, drew back the curtain discovering the shop and walked before it. The direction from *Woman in the Moon*, already quoted, is very similar. The shop of *Alexander and Campaspe* (1584, her Majesty's Children and Paul's) is admirably explained by the alcove stage; so is the

pavilion of *David and Bethsabe* (1599), III, 2; and the shop of *Edward IV* (1600), p. 63.¹

The direction of *Eastward Ho*, in saying "the middle door," suggests another consideration. We have assumed that the alcove stage was in the middle between the two other doors; the middle door is probably then the means of entrance to the alcove from the dressing-room. Perhaps the fact that it was usually concealed by the curtain will explain the directions which say, "Enter at one door . . . the other," the dramatist forgetting for the moment the existence of the third entrance, which was usually concealed by the stage curtain.²

These latter illustrations are, however, only of secondary importance. The two great objections to the rear stage of Brodmeyer are the fact that a large number of plays show clashes of door scenes with property and curtain scenes, and that in many scenes, if all the doors were concealed by the curtain, the action on the stage would often contradict the plain meaning of the lines. A third argument, hardly capable of direct proof, yet certainly to be carefully considered, is the importance of the doors themselves. They were valuable scenic details; when the balcony is used as the walls of a city, they are nearly always plainly in sight as the gates; when the balcony is the second story of a house, they are its street doors. But, more than this, they had what may be called a symbolic value. By the use of different doors the dramatists were able to show at once that characters entering at the same time came from two or three different places. By the use of scene-boards³ the visible doors

¹ Sometimes, however, real separate structures were used on the stage for shops, etc. though I believe the subject of such properties has never been investigated. Their use is clear in *Histro-mastix* (written 1590; published 1610): "Enter Lyon-rash to Fourcher sitting in his study at one end of the stage: At the other end enter Vourcher to Velure in his shop." Here there should be two doors—one for Lyon-rash, the other for Vourcher. The study and the shop can hardly be the doors: they cannot be the rear stage, but they must be on the rear stage so their occupants can be discovered. Other plays probably showing the use of structures are *Faery Pustoral*, *Bartholomen Fair*, and *Arden of Feversham*. This is a subject to which I hope to return at some future date.

² Perhaps the direction means rather that the opening of the middle door discovered the shop. Parallel cases, where doors seem used when one might expect curtains, are the non-Shakespearean *Richard II* (1591-96), V, 1, and the *Trial of Chivalry* (1605), II, 3. It is conceivable that the alcove was closed, not only by the curtains, but also by large doors; but more probably common doors are here referred to.

³ The existence of such boards has been denied, but always on theoretical grounds, not by any specific facts. So MATTHEWS ("Conventions of the Drama," pp. 257, 258, in *The His-*

became even more useful, for the boards showed from what precise place each party came. This is made absolutely clear in the directions of *The Cuckqueens' and Cuckolds' Errants* (written 1601, Paul's). The general direction reads: "Harwich. In midde of the Stage Colchester with Image of Tarlton, Signe and Ghirlond Vnder him also. The Raungers Lodge, Maldon, A Ladder of Roapes trussed vp neare Harwich. Highest and aloft the Title. The Cuckqueanes and Cuckolds Errants. A Long

torical Novel, 1901), says: "There was no need of the alleged placards declaring the scene; this would have been an intrusion in the eyes of Marlowe's contemporaries, who never cared where the place was so long as the play was interesting. These supposed signs are no more than the Victorian explanation of a need not felt by the Elizabethans; and they are not warranted by the passage of Sidney which is cited in support. So also APPLETION MORGAN (Introduction, *Titus Andronicus*, "Bankside Shakespeare," pp. 31, 32): "But the days when to represent change of scene, placards with 'Africa,' 'Vienna,' 'Paris,' 'Padua,' etc., written upon them were displayed must have been about over when Shakespeare began his career. The realism which began to wheel in a four post bedstead to make a bed room scene . . . certainly would have demanded the retirement of these placards." (See also BRANDL, Introduction, Vol. I, p. 27, and GENEVE, *Jahrbuch*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 138, 139). But the play mentioned in the text is certainly contemporaneous with Shakespeare, and was presumably played at Paul's playhouse, by no means a poorly furnished theater. It is true that the line in the *Spanish Tragedy*, "Hang up the title, our scene is Rhodes" (IV, 3, l. 16), does not, as BRANDL (*loc. cit.*, p. 28), truly observes, refer to scene-boards, but to the title-boards. These title-boards, or their substitutes, were used as early as 1528 when the Paul's boys gave *Phormio* for Cardinal Wolsey. The secretary of the Venetian ambassador wrote: "The hall in which they dined, and where the comedy was performed, had a large garland of box in front, in the center of which was inscribed in gilt letters, 'Terentii Phormio.'" Venetian State Papers, Jan. 8, 1528. These title-boards are perhaps referred to in the accounts of the Revels: "Sysse, cullers, pottes, Assydewe, golde, and silver used and occupied for the Garnyshinge of xiij titles," etc. (1579, p. 162, when tan plays were given); "Painting of ix titles with compartmentes, xv" (1580-81, p. 169, when seven plays were given). The familiar passage in the Induction to *Wily Beguiled* (Fleay dates 1596-97; published 1606) establishes the use of these title-boards beyond question, as do also the general directions of Percy's plays.

But scene-boards existed also, as the directions quoted in the text show. They were not, however, such primitive things as popular fancy represents them. The old stage never saw labels like "This is a street," "This is a house," and seldom such as "This is a tree," or "A mount." There is, so far as I am aware, but one existing direction which would go to prove such labels, that in PEYOT'S *Faery Pastoral* (written 1603, for Paul's), which, after describing the properties and furnishings of the stage, goes on to say, "Now if so be that the Properties of any of These, that be outward, will not serue the turne by reason of conourse of the People on the Stage. Then you may omit the sayd Properties which be outward and supplye their Places with their Nuncupations onely in Text Letters. Thus for some." Even here the labels are only a makeshift, and the real properties are assumed as usual. The scene-boards were not to take the place of furnishings so much as the place of programs. It would often be difficult even now to indicate by scenery whether the place of any particular scene were New York, London, or Paris, and this difficulty the scene-boards did away with. JUSSERAND (*Shakespeare in France*, p. 68) shows that early artists also felt the necessity of labels, reproducing a picture of Benozzo Gozzoli's where such a label is used, and (*Furnivall Memorial*, p. 186) quotes a prologue from an old French play, to the effect, that as for the place names

"vous les povez cognoistre
Par l'escrifel que dessus voyez estre."

That they existed in Elizabethan times, the citations in the text show.

Fourme." The play makes this confusing direction plain. Over one door was the word "Harwich;" over another, "Maldon;" over the middle entrance, "Colchester," with the sign of the inn which the rear stage seems to have represented, for in Act V two maids in this inn sit on the "long fourme" and tell each other dreams. The directions are all in the past tense, as if the author were describing an actual performance. Act I, scene 1, begins, "They entered from Maldon," and the scene all occurs in that place. Scene 2 says, "They [two rogues] mett from Maldon and Harwich," and one says to the other, "Thou beest welcome to Colchester." Scene 3 is in the same place; scene 4, in Harwich, beginning, "They entered from Harwich all" (p. 17), and containing an allusion to "that Ladder, hong." The play continues with this same sort of directions until the end, the place of action being consistent with the place designated by the sign above the doors through which the characters enter. Sidney's famous remark in the *Apology for Poetry* (1581) illustrates the same custom, again connecting the scene-boards with the doors: "What childe is there, that comming to a Play, and seeing *Thebes* written in great letters vpon an olde doore, doth beleue that it is *Thebes*?" (p. 52), and (p. 63), "You shall haue *Asia* of the one side and *Africk* of the other, and so many other vnder-kingdoms, that the Player, when he commeth in, must euer begin with telling where he is or els the tale will not be conceiued;"—obviously there are limitations to the number of scene-boards. Jasper Mayne in his poem on Jonson, in *Jonsonus Virbius* (1638), says that in Jonson's plays "The stage was still a stage, two entrances Were not two parts o' the world, disjoin'd by seas." So Envy, in the Prologue to the *Poetaster* (1601, Chapel Children), comes expecting to find the scene of the play laid in London. Instead she discovers, obviously from some visible source, that it is Rome, saying

The scene is, ha!

Rome? Rome? and Rome? Crack, eye strings, and your balls
Drop into earth.

The triple mention, in view of these other references, suggests that she is reading scene-boards over each door, and from their

uniformity discovers that the scene throughout the play is to be in one city. In *Eastward Ho* (1605, Blackfriars), IV, 1, "Enter Slitgut with a pair of ox-horns, discovering Cuckhold's Haven above," certainly alludes to a similar thing, for that is where the scene is located. Perhaps such a direction as "Enter two Carpenters under Newgate" of *Warning for Fair Women* (1598, Chamberlain's), II, l. 1510, is an evidence of this same custom. This would be perhaps the easiest way to explain ll. 690-870, and 1913-52, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (1594, Queen's), in which characters on one part of the stage are able by looking through a glass to see events supposed to be occurring miles away, but which are really acted on the stage at the same time. *Common Conditions* (ca. 1576) and *Two Lamentable Tragedies* (1601) are two other plays which suggest some such conventionalized use of the doors with scene-boards. *Jocasta* also (Grey's Inn, 1566) perhaps used them. Neglecting, however, these few less certain illustrations, the unquestioned ones show clearly that this custom of scene-boards prevailed at the beginning of the seventeenth century. They do not, of course, show how general it was, but there is nothing in the directions to indicate that it was anything unusual, and Sidney's and Mayne's reference would imply that it was widely practiced at two widely different dates. All connect it closely with the doors also, which, if this was an established custom, must therefore have been in sight most if not all of the time.

The importance of the doors from this and other causes mentioned, and the necessity that they be in sight throughout the play, the clashes resulting from supposing them only on the rear stage, the incongruous situations arising if all exits from the front stage were made through the curtained space, compel the opinion that in some theaters at least the doors were not hidden by the curtain. I would not claim but one form of theater. The Swan could not have had an alcove stage; the Red Bull picture shows no alcove stage; the Roxana and Messallina pictures, though they might be construed to do so, perhaps do not. But, in view of the evidence of the plays, on the one hand, and, on the other, of the lateness of date of the three pictures, and the general

inapplicability of the Swan picture, it does not seem too much of an assumption to admit the alcove stage as one of the possible forms, if not as the most general form of stage construction.

Probably Brodmeier would object that rear-stage scenes, and "fourth" stage scenes were being confused, and that the alcove stage would not be large enough for all the rear-stage scenes of the plays. On the contrary, the curtained space of the Roxana, the Messallina, or the Red Bull picture, even if very shallow, would be large enough for practically every scene certainly played on the rear stage. The plays do demand a rear stage of considerable size; the following directions prove that: "An arras is drawne, and behinde it (as in sessions) sit the L. Maior, Justice Suresbie, and other Justices; Sheriffe Moore and the other Sherife sitting by. Smart is the plaintife, Lifter the prisoner at the barre" (p. 6, *Sir Thomas More*, ca 1590). "Winchester, Arundel, and other Lords, discovered; the Lord Treasurer kneeling at the council-table" (p. 188, *Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 1607, Queen's). In II *Tamburlaine*, II, 4 (1690, Admiral's), a bed and eleven people occupied the rear stage, and in *Lust's Dominion* (1657, but certainly an early play), I, 3, at least seven people are discovered. More instances might be cited, but I know of no specific direction for more people than this to be discovered on the rear stage. But because the rear stage was large enough to hold eleven people and a bed is no reason for supposing a larger stage than that behind the curtains of the pictures. Brodmeier's rear-stage scenes may require a larger stage, but the proof that they were rear-stage scenes is because, on account of them, the rear stage must have been large. Such argument in a circle proves nothing. Even if these were rear-stage scenes, the rear stage of the Messallina or the Roxana stage would probably suffice. Brodmeier, in making the distinction between scenes on the *Vorderbühne* and *Hinterbühne*, or what I, in consequence, have called *out* and *in* scenes, seems to have forgotten that most, if not all, *Hinterbühne* scenes are really full stage scenes. On his stage, especially, no marked distinction between the two stages could have existed. An alcove stage, perhaps, was elevated above

the floor of the rear stage,¹ but on the Swan Theater stage, as soon as the imagined curtains are drawn, no distinction remains. The alcove stage is amply sufficient for staging all the unquestioned rear-stage scenes of plays dating between 1577 and 1603. It need not necessarily have been small. As has been pointed out, it could in the Fortune have been twenty feet long, and then have left ten feet on either side for the doors. In the Roxana and Messallina pictures the curtained space is represented as at least twelve feet wide, and the Roxana does not show the whole width.² Brodmeier denies (p. 62) that the curtains of these pictures—the only ones showing a curtain of any kind, one remembers—are true stage curtains, because the concealed space is too small; but at the same time is forced to think the cell of Prospero in the *Tempest* not the rear stage, because the rear stage which he assumes is too large for it (p. 64). The fact is that Brodmeier, in increasing the importance of the rear stage to fit the alternation theory, has increased its size until, in both size and frequency of use, it surpasses the front stage. Yet the unmistakable evidence of the plays and the pictures is that the front, not the rear stage, was the larger and the more used. Common-sense points to the same consideration. To suppose, as Brodmeier does (p. 8), that all the "play" in the *Taming of a Shrew* was on the rear stage is, on the face of it, unreasonable. Speech on the rear stage, inclosed as he would have it, would be inaudible to most of the house, and action so far removed from the audience, especially on a stage whose front portion was crowded with spectators, would be invisible. Instead of most actions occurring on the rear stage, no matter whether it were the alcove stage or Brodmeier's, the larger number of scenes, even when they began on the rear stage, must have moved down toward the front of the stage, into the center of the theater, close to the audience. This is perhaps one reason why so few scenes open or close with "situations." The door and balcony tests, then, rest

¹This supposition would explain a little more easily than the balcony *Wounds of Civil War* (1594, Admiral's), IV, 1; *Titus Andronicus* (1600, Chamberlain's and others), V, 2.

²The basis for this estimate is the height of the railing, which could be scarcely less than a foot; nothing is allowed, moreover, for perspective.

on a false view of the stage and disregard the plain evidence of the plays.

The only other important test¹ which Brodmeier employs is that of the use of properties: scenes set with properties are from that reason rear stage scenes.² For this test there seems to a modern reader to be more probability than for any other. Naturally, if there was a curtain, the properties would be arranged behind it. This is especially true of a certain class of properties, like rocks, shops, trees, woods, and tombs, which are naturally immovable. It is true to a lesser degree of beds and thrones. The placing of such furnishings takes time and, if done in plain

¹ The possibility of confusing the stage curtain and bed curtain has already been discussed. It should be noted that the curtain is sometimes referred to in different ways. A very common mode of indicating it is by the word "discover": "Winchester, Arundel, and other Lords, discovered; the Lord Treasurer kneeling at the council-table." (*Sir Thomas Wyatt*, p. 188, 1607, Queen's). Sometimes, however, doors are used for discoveries—as in *Woman is a Weathercock* (pp. 49, 50, Whitefriars, entered 1611). "Enter Scudmore, like a serving man, with a letter." "Scudmore passeth one door, and entereth the other, where Bellafont sits asleep in a chair under a taffata canopy." Sometimes, as BRODMEIER suggests (p. 92), "enter" means rather a discovered scene. So in *Cymbeline*, II, 2 (folio), "Enter Imogen in her bed, and a lady," the scene seems surely an *in scene*, as does also *Histrionastix* (1610; dated by Simpson, 1599), II, 1. "Enter Plenty in Majesty, upon a Throne; heaps of gold; Plutus, Ceres & Bacchus doing homage;" and "Enters a Schoomaker, sitting vpon the stage at worke;" *George A Greene* (p. 99, 1599, Sussex's; Henslowe, 1593). However, "Enter Semele drawne out in her bed," *Silver Age* (p. 154, 1613), clearly should be a discovery, but quite as clearly is not. Sometimes, not always, the word "arras" means the curtain, a circumstance which makes doubtful another of Brodmeier's tests. In the following direction it seems very clearly the curtain: "An arras is drawne, and behinde it (as in sessions) sit the L. Maior, Justice Suresbie, and other Justices; Sherife Moore and the other Sheiffe sitting by. Smart is the plaintiff, lifter the prisoner at the barre" (*Sir Thomas More* p. 6, ca. 1590). The only test of Brodmeier's of any importance not yet discussed is the use of the trap, which he suggests to have been inside the curtain. See the following scenes to show that it was not always so: *Looking Glass for London*, II, 558 ff.; *The Wonder of Women*, III, 1; and the general direction to Percy's MSS play *Aphrodialis* (dated 1602, for Paul's), "A Trap door in the middle of the stage."

A test for the rear stage not mentioned by Brodmeier, but given by Kilian, is the presence of "dead" or "sleeping" persons in a scene with no one to remove them. Usually bodies are removed, something in directions or text showing plainly that this was done, as in *Antonio's Revenge* (1602, Paul's), IV, 1, or II *Tamburlaine* (1590, Admiral's), II, 3. Even when there is no hint of removal, but when other characters are on the stage who probably could bear away the bodies, it is often best to suppose that the specific direction is merely forgotten. But in *Endimion* (1571, Paul's), II, 3, it is much better for the play that Endimion remain asleep upon the stage, and the same is true in *Dido* (1594, Chapel), II, 1, of Ascanius. In *Edward I* (1593), sc. 16, there is no one left to remove the body, and in II *Edward IV* (1600, Derby's), p. 155, the bodies of the two princes seem brought on the stage for the sole purpose of leaving them there.

² BRODMEIER says (p. 97): "Bühneninventar wird nur auf die Hinterbühne gebracht," He does feel forced to have (p. 14) the bed of II *Henry IV*, IV, 4, stand on the front stage for a little while, but says: "Dennach ware dieses die einzige Stelle die ein grösseres Inventarstück auf die Vorderbühne bringt." The exception implied in "grösseres" can mean little, however, for (p. 91) he supposes *Coriolanus*, I, 3, a rear stage scene because two stools are used in it.

sight, more or less disturbs dramatic illusion. We modern readers, accustomed to a stage with an ideal of complete illusion, naturally tend to put such scenes on the rear stage, where they could be arranged out of the sight of the audience. Yet if "clashes" mean anything this supposition is not true. In many plays a property scene occurs immediately after another property scene, or after a scene for some other reason to be considered an *in* scene. One scene or the other, according to the alternation theory, must therefore have been played on the front stage. Of course, one fundamental principle of the theory is that no property did stand on the front stage, but another is that the performance was continuous. One or the other must give way, and the falseness of the first is shown by the Swan picture itself, where the bench, the only property shown by any of the pictures, stands, not in the supposed curtain space, but far out upon the front stage.

The general direction of the *Faery Pastoral* (written for Paul's in 1603) shows the same thing:

Highest, aloft and on the Top of the Musick Tree the Title The Faery Pastorall, Beneath him pind on Post of the Tree The Scene Eluida Forrest. Lowest off all ouer the Canopie ΝΑΙΠΑΙΤΒΟΔΑΙΟΝ or Faery Chappell. A Kiln of Brick. A Fowen Cott. A Hollowe Oake with vice of wood to shutt to. A Lowe well with Roape and Pullye. A Fourme of Turues. A greene Bank being Pillowe to the Hed but. Lastly A Hole to creep in and out. Now if so be that the properties of any of These, that be outward, will not serue the turne by reason of concurse of the People on the Stage, Then you may omitt the sayd Properties which be outward and suplye their Places with their Nuncupations onely in Text Letters. Thus for some.

"The sayd Properties which be outward" can hardly mean anything else than that some usually stood out on the front stage, and that they would thus be in the way of the spectators sitting on the stage. Probably in this play these properties were the kiln, the bank, the cot, the hollow oak, and the well; for only the chapel seems to be concealed by the "canopy." These instances alone show one of the main principles of alternation not always to have been true; the following scenes from other plays indicate the same thing:

Dido (1594, Chapel Children, III, 1).—If the pictures which Aeneas is describing as visible were represented at all, they must have been hung on the front stage, for sc. 2 must begin with the discovery of Ascanius.

In *Looking Glass for London* (1594), l. 558, Remilia says: "Shut close these Curtaines straight, and shadow me." "They draw the Curtaines, and Musicke plaies." Then Magi enter, and, at the command of the king, "the Magi with their rods beate the ground, and from vnder the same riseth a braue Arbour." Meanwhile the king exits, to return in more splendid attire. Directly after his re-entrance it thunders, the king "drawes the Curtaines, and findes her stroken with thunder, blacke." Here there is not only a property, the arbour, outside the curtain, but the trap-door, which Brodmeier supposes in the rear stage, is also obviously not concealed by it. In much the same way in *Wonder of Women* (1606, Blackfriars) the altar and trap are without the curtains in III, 1, and V, 1.

David and Bethsabe (1599): In II, 2, there is a banquet; in sc. 3, a banquet; but in sc. 4 a throne and the balcony as the walls of a town are employed together. Thus three property scenes come in succession.

Alexander and Campaspe (1584, Paul's and Her Majesty's Children), III, 3, 4: If the shop in which sc. 3 occurs was the rear stage, as is at least possible, Diogenes' tub of sc. 4 must have been on the front stage. In the last scene the shop is described as in sight at the same time. A similar situation is to be found in V, 3, 4. This play is most easily explained by making the alcove stage the shop, and by placing the tub near one of the doors. It is curious to observe however—and this perhaps would make one think the shop a structure—that no concealed entrance is necessary for it; all people appearing in it go in and come out of it in plain sight of the audience.

Alphonsus (1599), III, 1, 2: Scene 1 uses a chair which should be throne-like, but perhaps was not; so does sc. 2, but the scene is in a different country. Scene 2, moreover, employs a trap-door and, perhaps, woods, a change of place from the palace to a solitary grove occurring without clearing the stage. Unless

one prefers supposing chair and woods on the rear stage at the same time, one must place either woods or chair on the front stage.

Sapho and Phao (1584, Paul's and Her Majesty's Children), IV, 3: At the end of the scene Sapho orders her maids to "draw the curtains." There is no *exeunt* direction for them. Scene 4 should use a forge in the shop of Vulcan; in V, 1, this forge is alluded to as present; it was probably used, therefore, in both scenes; in V, 1, it is apparently near one of the doors, and the seat of Sapho is also in view.

The Old Wives' Tale (1595, Queen's): This play is one succession of property clashes. If the cell of Sacrapant is the rear stage, both the well and the cross must be outside the curtain (see Part II for more detailed description).

These scenes are none of them conclusive, for by using structures for the shop, etc., or doors for some of the discoveries, it is perhaps possible to explain all the plays without placing properties on the front stage. But why should this be considered necessary? The *Faery Pastoral* and Swan pictures show that properties did stand on the front stage. It must have been set with stools for the spectators, and these were no doubt used in scenes requiring seats, even perhaps for such large scenes as the Senate of Rome. Tables also are brought in extremely often or assumed without any direction whatever. If all scenes where seats are used were classed as *in* scenes, many plays would be nothing but a continual series of clashes; the *Staple of News* (1625), for example, or almost any of Jonson's plays. Plays are extremely numerous, moreover, in which larger properties are brought in; for example, II *Henry VI*, (1623); *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody* (1605), and *Golden Age* (1611, Queen's at Red Bull),¹ which show that even so awkward a property as a bed was

¹ II *Henry VI*, folio, 134, has the direction: "Bed put forth", *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody* (1605), p. 200: The scene is an antechamber in which a commission is waiting for Elizabeth. A woman says she will tell Elizabeth, but Tame says: "It shall not need . . . Presse after her, my Lord." "Enter Elizabeth in her bed." She says: "We are not pleased with your intrusion, Lords." This can perhaps, since it is so very unrealistic, be interpreted as a discovered scene. *The Golden Age*, 1611 (Queen's, Red Bull), p. 67, cannot so be explained, however. The direction reads: "Enter the foure old Beldams drawing out Danae's bed: she in it." The scene changes as in the instance just mentioned, from antechamber to bedroom.

sometimes brought upon the stage without the slightest explanation. Perhaps these properties were not used on the front stage, but wherever used they were brought on in sight of the audience, which amounts to the same thing. The only obvious reason for not supposing properties on the front stage is the difficulty, delay, and lack of realism in the bringing on and taking off. Difficulty and delay one may admit, but realism—so far as the plays go, there is no indication that the Elizabethans were at all adverse to the bringing on of furnishings before them. If one can judge from the frequent occurrence and long continuance of the custom, they rather enjoyed it. At any rate, the burden of proof is decidedly upon the alternationists when they assume that, because of this dislike, or more probably because of modern dislike for such a practice, properties were never used on the front stage.

Of the other principles, the one that no two *in* scenes, differently set, could directly succeed each other, is of course undeniable. Some pause, however short, was necessary for the rearrangement. The alternationists, insistent upon a continuous performance, have however, assumed that the dramatists composed special *out* scenes for the sole purpose of filling these pauses.¹ Any short scene apparently unnecessary to the plot, they, for that reason, label at once as an *out* scene, and the scenes before and after as *in* scenes. The *Merchant of Venice* (1596, 1600), III, 5, is a case in point.² It is the punning conversation of Launcelot and Jessica, and, its value not being easily apparent to a modern reader, it is at once selected as an *out* scene, even though it ends the act; and there is no reason, therefore, for supposing an *out* scene at all. Having determined that scene 5 is an *out* scene, of course, scene 4 becomes as *in* scene—and another proof of alternation is thus secured. But such scenes may have arisen from very different reasons: to allow a change of costume, or, as perhaps in this case, to give the actor of the part of Launcelot an opportunity to display his talents. An author did not need to bother himself

¹ KILIAN (*Jahrbuch*, XXXVI, p. 235) is so insistent upon a continuous performance that he denies even the act intermissions, unmindful of the numerous clashes which would result and the specific directions, of such plays as *Wars of Cyrus* (1594, Chapel), I; the "plat" of *Dead Man's Fortune* (1591-93); *Wonder of Women* (1606, Blackfriars); and all of Percy's plays, written apparently for Paul's at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

² See KILIAN, *loc. cit.*

to fill the slight pauses arising from the stage management. Most of the pauses must have been short—the *out* scenes suggested to fill them average about two minutes in length; why should the spectators for so short a time require special amusement? Such scenes did not shorten the play, nor, according to the theory, improve it; they were mere stop-gaps. If it were necessary to have something going on, the orchestra was always ready to play or the clown to come in with his jigs and nonsense.¹ The alternation theory, when it goes so far as this, seems to me to be solving a non-existent difficulty, and to be useless and improbable. As presented by Brodmeier, however, it is much more credible. He admits the act intermissions (see, for example, p. 79); he admits the use of music, even within the act, to fill the time used in setting properties (p. 90); he recognizes split scenes, without emphasizing, however, that they are a custom before unnoted by students, and therefore deserving of more attention.²

With all these exceptions and variations—and without them the theory is not to be received—the alternation theory loses most of its force as a constructive influence on the plays. *In* scenes were not unnecessarily preceded by *out* scenes; there were a number of ways to avoid them, and Brodmeier wisely does not emphasize, indeed hardly alludes to, what former writers have made much of. As stated by him, the theory amounts, constructively, hardly to more than saying that *in* scenes were often preceded by *out* scenes—a fact no one would deny. But in attempting to prove alternation important and of wide applica-

¹(See HALL, quoted in BULLEN'S Marlowe, Vol. I, p. xx).

²In a split scene the action begins on the rear stage, but gradually transfers itself to the front stage. At first it uses properties, and the impression of location is strong, but toward the end the conversation itself usually shows either by an absence of reference or by some direct hint that the setting is no longer before the audience. Some such scene seems to be described by GENEÉ (*Entwickelung des scenischen Theaters*, pp. 42, 43) as occurring on the stage of Johann Rist, 1647 in Königsberg—a stage which he thinks showed English influence. A typical scene occurs in *Histro-mastix*, II, 1, 2 (written 1599; published 1610). Scene 1 begins; "Enter Plenty in Majesty, upon a Throne; heapes of gold; Plutus, Ceres, Bacchus doing homage." Scene 2 has a curtain drawn discovering a "Market set about a Crosse". The throne is left vacant at l. 46, when the curtain could have been closed, the action transferred to the front stage, and the rear stage rearranged.

Split scenes must be assumed very often if the alternation theory is to be held at all. Brodmeier even in Shakespeare is compelled to resort to them many times; for example, *Richard II*, 1, 3, 4 (p. 84); *Henry VIII*, 1, 2, 3 (p. 86); *Richard III*, 4, 5 (p. 92); *Hamlet*, III, 1, 2 (p. 94).

tion he uses tests for *in* scenes which are found, when applied logically and completely to contemporary plays, to be self-contradictory and rather to discredit than prove the theory. They rest either on an unproved reconstruction of the stage, as in the case of the door and balcony tests, or, in that of the properties, on a modern idea of dramatic propriety. The whole theory as an important factor in play-construction is as yet only a figment of the imagination; and the fact that the plays of Shakespeare have been arranged according to it proves hardly more than that the imagination has worked consistently. The more complete a play is in directions, the more difficulty does it present when one tries to make it conform to the alternation system. Conversely, the early plays, like *Cambyses* (ca. 1570), which have almost no stage or property directions, probably because they were played on the simplest of stages and with practically no furnishings, are for that reason the easiest to arrange into brilliant examples of alternation. All this throws doubt on the theory.

But worse than this is an objection which not only would make it unproved, but unprovable. Perhaps no plays can be accepted as reliable evidence in this matter. The alternation theory rests largely on the succession of scenes, and must therefore deal with copies of the plays which represent them as they were actually produced. Such notes as the following are therefore disquieting: From the printer's address, *Tamburlaine*, 1592:

I have purposely omitted and left out some fond and frivolous gestures, digressing, and, in my poor opinion, far unmeet for the matter, which I thought might seem more tedious unto the wise than any way else to be regarded, though haply they have been of some vain-conceited fondlings greatly gaped at, what time they were showed upon the stage in their graced deformities.

A note in a MS version of *Bonduca* (*Athenaeum*, February 14, 1903) explaining an hiatus in the text:

The occasion why these [scenes] are wanting here, the books whereby it was first acted from is lost; and this hath beene transcribed from the fowle papers of the Author wh. were found.

Stationer to the Reader, 1647 Folio of Beaumont and Fletcher:

One thing I must answer before it is objected; 'tis this. When these comedies and tragedies were presented on the stage, the actors omitted some scenes and passages with the author's consent as occasion led them: and when private friends desired a copy, they then and justly too, transcribed what they acted; but now you have both all that was acted and all that was not, even the full perfect originals without the least mutilation, so that were the authors living they themselves would challenge neither more nor less than what is here put down, this volume being now so complete and finished that the reader must expect no future alterations.

If publishers took the liberty of editing whole scenes away, if the authors MSS do not represent the acted versions, if these MSS were themselves sometimes incomplete and defective, there is little chance for proving a theory which rests entirely on the acted alternation of scenes.

Yet if the alcove stage be allowed, there certainly are in the plays hints of alternation. *Old Fortunatus* (1600, Admiral's), perhaps by chance, perhaps by the very necessities of the story, falls into an almost perfect succession of *in* and *out* scenes; so does *Antonio's Revenge* (1602, Paul's), if one assume several split scenes. *Sir Giles Goosecap* (1606, Chapel), V; *Edward I* (1593), V; *Arden of Feversham* (1592), V, provided the texts are accepted as complete, also illustrate it. In most of these cases the directions themselves practically demand the rear stage. When that is the case, no one can deny the existence of alternation. Sometimes it does even happen that an unfurnished scene intervenes between two obvious rear-stage scenes, and alternation is undoubtedly illustrated. But when, as most of the time, alternation rests only on unproved tests arising from an unproved stage, and is based upon the exact succession of scenes in texts of whose integrity, in view of contemporary comments, no one can be sure, the theory becomes rather a pleasant exercise of the imagination, an imposition of modern ideas upon ancient custom, than an established principle of the universal method of Elizabethan staging. It is unproved as yet, and, in view of the difficulty of securing adequate tests or absolutely certain sources of information, seems almost incapable of proof. It may be accepted as an occasional method of staging; but as the universal

and common and fundamental principle which every dramatist was bound to observe, it certainly cannot be accepted. Indeed some plays cannot at all be explained by it; these, with the staging which they illustrate, will be considered in Part II.

GEORGE F. REYNOLDS.

SHATTUCK SCHOOL,
Faribault, Minn.

